



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

# The American Catholic quarterly review



205

A5123



LELAND · STANFORD · JUNIOR · UNIVERSITY













THE  
AMERICAN  
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

---

VOLUME XX.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1895.

LIBRARY

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA:

CHARLES A. HARDY,

PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR,

505 CHESTNUT STREET.

134304

---

COPYRIGHT, 1895,

BY

CHARLES A. HARDY.

---

YASSEL  
ROHLL. CROHATECH  
YTERVAD

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<b>JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI.</b> By <i>Rev. T. J. Shahan, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	1
De Rossi's eminence in his chosen work, 1; His early life, 2; His father's opposition to his vocation as an antiquarian, 3; A familiar figure in the great archives and libraries of Europe, 4; Splendid celebration of his sixtieth birthday, 5; His own joy at the good he had done, 6; The vast range of his acquirements, 7; The passion for inscriptions, 8; An invaluable link in the science of Christian epigraphy, 9; De Rossi's name overshadows those of all his predecessors, 10; Qualities of the man that greatly aided him in his work, 11; His "Inscriptiones Christianae," 12; His knowledge of sources and the superiority of his system, 14; Chronology and geology as aids to his work, 15; Relics of the medieval Irish missionaries, 17; De Rossi's researches in the Roman Catacombs, 19; Simplicity of his methods, 20; The two lines on which he conducted his investigations, 22; Documents that aided him, 23; Emptying the ancient historic crypts, 24; Reconstructing the under-world of Christian Rome, 25; The great storehouse of information he has left, 27; An aid even to the theologian, 28; De Rossi's work in cataloguing the Vatican archives, 29; The wide field covered by his minor writings, 30; He had also a strong talent for organizing, 31; Saving Christian monuments from destruction, 32; How to fitly judge of him as a savant, 33; Distinguished for modesty as well as scientific probity, 34; Harmony between natural aspirations and Catholic doctrine, 36.	
<b>THE CENTENARY OF MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.</b> By <i>Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	37
A century's change in Catholic Ireland, 37; Working of the penal laws in the eighteenth century, 38; Their first relaxation, 39; Irish seminarians abroad, 40; The new departure of 1795—a national seminary provided for, 41; Beginning of the great institution at Maynooth—its first president, 42; Close of Dr. Hussey's career, 44; Other members of the faculty, 45; From a small beginning has come a great development, 46; The institution attacked by the enemies of Catholicism, 47; Choice specimens of bigotry, 48; Some of the great professors in the college, 50; Dr. Russell and Dr. Murray contrasted, 51; Dr. Murray as a controversialist, 52; As a poet, 53; Many other names that might be dwelt upon, 54.	
<b>THE GRANDEUR OF ANCIENT ROME—A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.</b> By <i>Rt. Rev. Robert Seton, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	55
Almost the only ancient history worth knowing is that of Rome, 55; Why Roman conquests are justified politically and philosophically, 56; Essential points of difference between Roman and other civilizations, 57; The position of women as the test of a nation's greatness, 59; Roman tributes to virginity and chastity, 60; The Romans also distinguished for their patriotism, 61; The ancient Roman law close akin to that of Moses, 63; In Pagan Rome the way was prepared for Christianity, 64; Human nature inadequate without Christianity, 65.	
<b>THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT AT THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.</b> By <i>Gen. John Eaton, Ph.D., LL.D.</i> , . . . . .	66
One of the great surprises at the World's Fair in Chicago, 66; A surprise especially for those who think ill of the Church, 67; The exhibit was, indeed, phenomenal and fully served its purpose, 68; Statistics of the great collection, 69; All the work was not, of course, of uniform merit, 70; Pertinent questions on the various studies, 71; Impressions made to remain for a lifetime, 73; Effect of the exhibit on the various orders of teachers, 75; Reformatory and industrial school work, 76; Some prominent colleges, 77; Catholic education day at the Fair, 78; The speakers insisted on religious education, 79; How this exhibit was brought about, 81.	
<b>THE RECENT DECREES ON CHURCH MUSIC.</b> By <i>Rev. Hugh T. Henry</i> , . . . . .	82
Two important documents that recently emanated from the Congregation of Rites, 82; The frequent discussion of music reform in the Church, 83; The general spirit of the new regulation and decree, 85; With what the decree is concerned, 86; The spirit of liturgical reform was abroad, 89; Need felt for cheaper editions of books of liturgy, 90; The unification of chant aimed at by Pope Pius IX., 91; Why the Holy See insists on a certain edition, 92; The decree of April 10, 1883, 93; The regulation, 95; A similar set of rules previously issued, 97; Of what the regulation consists, 98; The poles of musical appreciation, 99; Limits to condescension to popular tastes, 100; Status given to the Gregorian chant by the regulation, 101; Summary of the theory regarding it, 102; Praise for the Palastrinesque style, 103; What is said of "chromatic music," 104; Theatrical character of certain music, 105; Provisions of various articles of the regulation, 106; For the future improvement of sacred music schools, 108; A constant provision for reducing the regulation to practice, 109; Instructions to promote the study of sacred music and reform abuses, 110.	



	PAGE
<b>THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATION.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	112
The two official documents bearing on the subject, 112; Legations in general, 113; Legations to particular churches, 114; The legates represent the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, 116; Delegations have existed since the first centuries of Christianity, 117; Decline of the vicariates, 118; Institution of delegations essential, 119; Delegations sent to civil powers, 120; This Papal right does not assume the union of Church and State, 121; A right inherent in the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, 122; The first representatives sent by the Holy See to civil powers, 124; Excellent results attained by Papal representation to secular governments, 125; The American delegation, 126; It is ecclesiastical, not diplomatic, 127; It will make a more perfect unity within the American Church, 128; The duty of Catholics to give aid to the Papal delegate, 129; The qualities required in the ecclesiastical diplomat, 130.	
<b>THE RELATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.</b> By <i>Rev. E. A. Pace, D.D.</i> , 131	131
Co-operation by which the various sciences are mutually helpful, 131; As to whether a particular science may employ a particular method, 132; A proper acquaintance with methods necessary, 133; The difficulty of marking the limits of psychology, 134; Psychology's vicissitudes, 135; Divergence of views regarding the scope of psychology, 136; An unsatisfactory definition, 137; Elasticity of the term "psychology," 138; An excursion into metaphysics, 139; An instructive diversity of opinion, 140; Facts show a condition fulfilled, 141; A science not to be condemned on account of the views of individual thinkers, 142; Absence of harmony in regard to this question, 143; The situation as shown by psychological literature, 144; Neutral position of experimental psychology, 145; A distinction also as to the knowledge of acts, 146; Some method must be followed to gain a scientific knowledge of any mental activity, 147; What the critics tell us, 148; The result of varying the conditions of mental activity, 149; How our conduct affects our appreciation of time, 150; Our mental processes have a duration, 151; The intensity of sensations, 152; Physiology and psychology in contact at many points, 153; Illustrations from various fields of science, 155; The practical bearings of experimental psychology, 156; Catholic philosophers should not be apathetic regarding it, 158; The results of experiment susceptible of philosophic interpretation, 159; Encouraging the spirit of research among Catholics, 160; A revolution of opinion that is not without precedent, 161.	
<b>A NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE ENCYCICAL "PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS"</b> By <i>Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i> , . . . . .	162
Adverse views of negatives, 162; The encyclical is not directly dogmatic, 163; Not intended to be an <i>ex-cathedra</i> utterance, 165; Does not teach verbal inspiration, 166; Teaching of the Fathers regarding the Holy Scriptures, 168; The encyclical does not add to the Tridentine and the Vatican decrees, 170; Various interpretations of the word "parts" given by Catholic theologians, 172; The encyclical does not ascribe absolute truth to the whole Bible, 173; Less important negatives in the encyclical, 175.	
<b>THE TREASURES OF THE CHURCH.</b> By <i>Rev. William Barry, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	176
Why everything in Europe seems to us so tinged with sadness, 176; A different condition in America, 177; Wide-spread ravages of materialism, 178; No wonder the contemplative are struck with sadness, 179; Not to lose religion is the supreme problem, 180; The state of things during the past century is not without precedent, 181; The Catholic idea of worship, 182; A great change that is opening before us, 183; The Catholic ritual aims at something far beyond poetry, 184; An important method of recommending our faith, 185; How we should present our religious credentials, 186; Christianity did not come into the world as an abstract principle, 187; The true starting point of religious discussion, 188; The extremes of Pharisaic ritualism and rationalism, 189; We should even aim to make the Catholic Church its own evidence, 190; Why the task of Catholicism should be more hopeful in America, 192.	
<b>SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , . . . . .	194
Essential oils—their manufacture, properties and uses, 194; Their origin, 196; How they are extracted, 197; Processes of extraction and expression, 198; Process of distillation, 200; Of solution, 201; Of maceration, 202; Of absorption, 203; Animal perfumes, 205; A few of the essential oils and their properties, 208.	
<b>THE CORRELATION OF ORDER AND JURISDICTION.</b> By <i>A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> , . . . . .	225
Anglican bewilderment as to jurisdiction, 225; The dual nature of spiritual power, 226; The constituents of a competent authority, 227; The doctrine and the fact of Papal jurisdiction in England, 229; Considerations on order, 230; Intimate relations of jurisdiction and order, 233; History of an Anglican anomaly, 234; The first really Anglican prelate, 235; Hazards involved in the Anglican theory of priesthood, 237.	
<b>INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES (THIRD ARTICLE).</b> By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> , . . . . .	238
Indian tribes of New England, 238; Catholic missionary efforts among the Hurons and the Iroquois, 239; John Eliot and others among the New England Indians, 240; Fate of these aborigines, 241; English prints of American Indian books, 242; Eliot's editions of the Scriptures for the Indians, 245; His great industry, 246; Character of existing copies of Indian works, 247; Other books prepared by Eliot, 248; The Indians of Pennsylvania, 250; Mather's works, 251; Thomas' account of Pennsylvania and other books, 252; The Mohegan or Stockbridge Indians, 253;	

# Table of Contents.

v

PAGE

The aborigines of New Jersey, etc., 255; Zeisberger's books in the Delaware language, 256; General remarks on New England Indian literature, 257; Catholic missions among the Indians, 259; Catholic Iroquoians living on Canadian soil, 260; Abenakis and Algonquins, 261; Aim of the French Jesuit missionaries, 262; Present condition of the Canadian Indians, 263; The United States might learn a lesson from Canada, 264.

## INDIFFERENTISM. By *Rev. Charles Coupe, S.J.*, . . . . . 266

Protestant England once in earnest as well as in error, 266; Difference between indifferentism and atheism, 267; The present spirit in non-Catholic religion is that of lawless liberalism, 268; The only issue and outcome of Protestantism, 269; The parent of indifferentism, 270; Why the Bible can never be an infallible rule of faith, 271; The only certain canon of Scripture is that fixed by the authority of the Church, 273; Protestants themselves acknowledge the insufficiency of the Bible, 274; The certainty of faith an intellectual and objective certainty, 275; Summary of the arguments so far presented, 276; Protestant apologists recognize that faith is an impossibility for them, 278; Protestantism leads not only to indifferentism, but to rationalism, 279; Indifferentism is against reason, 281; The very idea of God precludes indifferentism, 283; Indifferentism also against revelation, 285; Difficult position of the indifferentist as a sinner, 287.

## MARYLAND OR RHODE ISLAND—LORD BALTIMORE OR ROGER WILLIAMS—WHICH WAS FIRST? By *Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.*, . . . . . 289

The fundamental principle involved in Maryland toleration, 289; The date of the Rhode Island toleration compact, 290; Official oaths and the religious liberty act in Maryland, 291; Text of the Maryland toleration act, 292; What the law and the practice were in Maryland prior to 1648, 295; Position of the first Lord Baltimore, 296; His colony an asylum for persecuted fellow-Catholics, 298; Not simply toleration, but equality, his rule, 299; His sacrifices and sufferings in the cause of religious liberty, 300; Character of the Maryland charter, 302; Organization of the new colony, 303; Lord Baltimore's instructions to his Lieutenant-Governor, 304; Roger Williams, then, is ante-dated, 305; Evidence of leading historians, 307; Testimony borne by even Protestantized Maryland, 308; And the Jesuits were Lord Baltimore's advisers, 309; What Bancroft says, 310; Maryland, then, has two years' precedence over Rhode Island, 311.

## THE VICAR GENERAL. By *Rev. G. Peries, D.D.*, . . . . . 313

Who are understood by "Vicars," 313; Official assistants to bishops, as well in the early Western as in the Eastern Church, 314; Action of the Fourth Lateran Council, 315; Archdeacons supplanted by Vicars-General in the thirteenth century, 317; Extension of the Vicar-General's authority, 319; Voluntary and contentious jurisdiction, 320; The number of Vicars-General in a diocese, 321; A peculiar state of affairs under the old regime in France, 322; Plurality of Vicars-General admitted now in some countries, 324; When there are more than one, they are naturally independent of each other, 325; No special formula required for a Vicar-General's appointment, 325.

## GLADSTONE'S HORACE. By *Rev. H. T. Henry*, . . . . . 327

Quests of Englishmen in the realms of fact and fancy, 327; English names famous in Horatian literature, 328; Something better than a mere artist required in a proper interpreter of Horace, 329; The benefit of a multiplicity of translations, 330; Mr. Gladstone's diversity of rhythmic ministrations, 331; Characteristics of the versions of Francis and Bulwer, 333; The question of imitating the Horatian metre and stanza, 334; The sense and point of the author should at least be preserved, 336; To what extent Mr. Gladstone has succeeded, 337; Gladstone and Sir Theodore Martin, 338; One of Gladstone's notable successes, 340; Only one acquainted with the original can fully enjoy a translation of Horace, 341; Pleasure of a version which simply translates, 342; Only to a Horatian audience can a translation of Horace appeal successfully, 344.

## THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA" (Latin text). By *His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.* 346

## TRANSLATION OF THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA," . . . . . 357

## LEO XIII. AND THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA." By *Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph Schröder, D.D.*, . . . . . 369

An object of study, as well as of gratitude, respect and admiration, 369; Role of the Papacy in Church and society, 370; The pontificate of Leo XIII., 372; Leo XIII. and America, 374; Reason for the Holy Father's predilection for our country, 377; Leo XIII. and Catholic America, 378; The Apostolic Delegation, 379; Faith and reason, 380; Church and State, 381; The social question, 384; Advocating the cause of the working classes, 386; The Catholic press, 387; The best means the editor has for doing the best service to religion and society, 388.

## ITALY'S RECONCILIATION WITH THE HOLY SEE. By *Wilfred C. Robinson*, . . 389

A really valuable history of Pope Leo XIII., 389; Documents that glorify his pontificate, 390; The new Supreme Pontiff and the Kingdom of Italy, 391; The repeated rumors of reconciliation, 392; The Pope's ardent longing for this result, 393; The many infamies of the Italian government during Leo XIII.'s reign, 394; Intolerable position of the Pope in Rome, 395; The Revolution overreaching itself, 396; The Pope could have hastened the downfall of the Italian Kingdom, 397; A possible solution of the difficulty hinted at, 398.

	PAGE
"QUID MIHI ET TIBI, MULIER?" By <i>Rev. A. E. Breen, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	399
The long vexed passage, John II., 4, 399; Superiority of Challoner's text, 400; Examination of the text in question, 401; Conclusion to be drawn from Christ's performing the miracle, 402.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , . . . . .	404
Petroleum—an historical sketch, 404; Table showing the yearly production, average price, and total value of oil, 1859-1893, 419; The world's production of petroleum, 420.	
THE RUSSIAN STATE CHURCH. By <i>Bryan J. Clinch</i> , . . . . .	449
Russia and the Pope's appeal for Christian reunion, 449; A French writer's optimistic view, 450; Peculiar relations of Russia to the Catholic Church, 451; Origin of the Greek schism, 452; The conversion of Russia, 453; Religious affairs in Russia and its borderland since the Council of Florence, 454; Difficulties of Catholics under the Czar, 455; Points in the State Church opposed to the Catholic faith, 456; The question of absolute power, 457; Catholics under the present Czar, 458; No reason for expecting the immediate union of Russia with Rome, 459.	
PURE VS. DILUTED CATHOLICISM. By <i>Very Rev. A. F. Hewit, C.S.P.</i> , . . . . .	460
Matthew Arnold and the "New Universal Church of the Future," 460; The utmost that the Roman Catholic Church can concede, 461; The definitions of the Church irreformable, 462; Whence springs the temptation to dilute Catholic doctrine, 463; What is necessary to preserve the Catholic doctrine in its genuine purity, 464; Theology of the right sort an imperative want of the intelligent laity, 466; Doctrine, considered as a truth, is immutable, 467; The recent action of the Holy See regarding the Eastern Churches, 468; Very little of a Protestant spirit among them, 469; Difficult position of certain Protestant clergymen, 470; Who can see what is to become of Protestantism? 471; Difficulties in the way of well-meaning non-Catholics, 472; The way to surmount the internal difficulty of ignorance, 473; The clergy as the upholders of the Catholic religion, 474; Calumnies against the Church and her agencies, 475; The work of exposing the lies about the Church, 476; Importance of Catholics leading virtuous and exemplary lives, 477; No indication of a general movement of a return to Catholicism, 478; The great obstacle in the way of this return, 479; Position of those who disbelieve in all religion, 480; And of unprejudiced outsiders, 481; The only possible union of all Christians is in the Catholic Church, 482; Even some of the discipline of the Church cannot be changed, 483; The three essential constituent principles of the Catholic religion, 484; The mission of the clergy, 485.	
ABOUT THE UTAH SAINTS. By <i>M. A. C.</i> . . . . .	486
The Mormons and their capital, 486; Characteristics of Salt Lake City, 487; Original seclusion of the settlement 488; Opposition of the Latter-day Saints to every form of government but their own, 489; The polygamous feature of Mormonism, 490; Awful miseries of women in the Mormon valley, 491; Whence they were "gathered in," 492; Their preternatural ugliness, 493; Relations of Federal officials with the colony, 494; Brigham Young a declared enemy of education, 495; The songs of Mormonism, 496; The best antidote to Mormonism would be the spread of Catholic doctrine, 497; A great work begun in Utah by Catholic agencies, 498; Death and character of Brigham Young, 499; Irish in Utah, but not among the "Saints," 500.	
OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART. By <i>Rt. Rev. Robert Seton, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	501
Religious truth the chief subject of early Christian art, 501; Scope of the subject of this paper, 502; The fall of our first parents, 503; Cain and Abel and Melchisedech, 504; Noe's ark and the barque of Peter, 505; Abraham and Isaac and the Good Shepherd, 506; Moses and Elias, 507; Christ and His Church, 508; The religious picture books of the Middle Ages, 509.	
GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. By <i>Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	510
The Thirty Years' War the real end of the Middle Ages, 510; Character of the German empire in the sixteenth century, 511; Effects of the "Reformation" in Germany, 512; Alliances during the first period of the Thirty Years' War, 514; Gustavus Adolphus in the second period supported by France, 516; France's object was her own aggrandisement, 518; Secret of the successes of Gustavus Adolphus, 520; Richelieu alarmed at these successes, 521; The establishment of liberty in Germany not the Swedish monarch's aim, 522; His death followed by reverses for the Protestants, 523; Results of the peace of Westphalia, and the Pope's position, 525.	
THE OPENING OF A JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATE DOCUMENT "CUM MAGNOPERE." By <i>Rev. G. Peries, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	528
Origin of the new Discipline in regard to criminal cases, 528; A natural deduction from a provision of the Third Plenary Council, 529; The mode of originating the process itself, 530; The two phases of a disciplinary inquiry before the ecclesiastical courts, 532; The "inquisitio judicialis," 534; No proceedings can be taken unless the accused be <i>diffamatus</i> , 536; Exceptions, 538; The concealment of crime nowadays extremely difficult, 539; Frequent breaches in judicial theories, 540; Conclusions still open to discussion, 541; The elements making up a judicial instruction, 542.	

	PAGE
<b>THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SYRIAC GOSPELS.</b> By <i>Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i> . . .	543
History of this discovery, 543; Description of the palimpsest, 544; The writing containing the gospel-text, 545; Peculiarities of the Syriac gospels, 546; Peculiar readings and Syriac variations, 547; The Sinaitic text represents a very early Syriac version, 549; Various explanations of the text problems, 551; Philo's theory of the origin of the human soul, 552; Origin of the Lewis text, 554; Compared with the Curetonian, 555; Variations of the Syriac version before the Pesitto, 556.	
<b>CONTROVERSY IN HIGH PLACES.</b> By <i>A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> , . . .	557
Discussion between the Protestant Bishop of Manchester and the Catholic Bishop of Salford, 557; Fallacies resulting from Dr. Moorehouse's attitude, 558; No basis for superiority on the part of the Established Church, 559; Weakness of the Archbishop of Canterbury's position, 560; Bishop Billsborrow's attitude is based on solid ground, 562; Attitude of the Catholic as opposed to that of the Anglican mind, 563; The only way to effect "reunion," 565; What is involved in the controversy about the supremacy of the Holy See, 567; Dr. Moorehouse's position fatal to doctrine and discipline, 569.	
<b>ITALY'S SILVER JUBILEE.</b> By <i>Rev. William Poland, S.J.</i> , . . .	571
United Italy and the conditions preceding it, 571; Victor Emmanuel and his revolutionary masters, 572; The taking of Rome and the farcical plebiscite, 573; The law of guarantees and the freedom of the Pope, 574; A "great nation" living far beyond its means, 575; Confiscation of Church property has not stopped the ever increasing deficits, 576; Over-taxation has brought hardship to all classes, 577; Italy's tariff methods illustrated, 578; Enormous increase of the Italian public debt, 579; The banks have been greatly strained, 580; Silver swept away and paper at a great discount, 581; Business failures and heavy mortgages, 582; Vandalism of the government—Premier Crispi, 583; Evolution of his political career, 584; Attitude of Italian Catholics towards the monarchy, 586; Why the truth about "United Italy" has not been told sooner, 587; Effect of the example of public robbery given by the government, 588; It is time the people were growing tired of the abuses, 589; A gigantic theft of charitable funds, 590; Rome as a capital has failed the purpose of the revolutionists, 591.	
<b>A BENEDICTINE RESTORATION.</b> By <i>R. F. O'Connor</i> , . . .	592
Origin of the great monastery of Solesmes, 592; Its early history, 593; Restored after the Hundred Years' War, 595; A period of deteriorating influence, 596; Reform by the Saint Maur congregation, 597; Dispersion of the monks by the Revolution, and the restoration of the Solesmes house by Dom Guéranger, 598; Its vicissitudes in the meantime, 599; Meeting and overcoming great difficulties, 600; Installation of the new community, 601; Since then it has played a very important part, 602; Dom Guéranger's controversy with Prince de Broglie, 603; His services at the Vatican Council, 604; His death and the honors paid to his memory, 605.	
<b>CATHOLIC PROTECTORIES AND REFORMATORIES.</b> By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i>	607
Christianity has ever proved its divine origin by its charities, 607; This part of its mission it has also extended to education, 608; The Church's institutions of education and charity in America, 609; The pre-eminent position of reformatories and protectories, 610; A few of the leading institutions of this kind, 611; Though the smallest in number, they are among the most important of the Church's works, 612; The two great charities of New York, 613; Lord Rosebery's tribute to Father Drumgoole, 615; The New York Catholic protector and its founder, 616; Archbishop Hughes' tribute to Dr. Ives and his work, 618; The Protector's departments, 619; The Church's practice of the virtue of charity has no parallel, 620; Girard College, Philadelphia, 621; Public policy as a motive for caring for the unfortunate classes, 622; The duty of the State, 623; The public charities of some of our great American cities, 624; Embarrassing circumstances of the child problem, 625; The duty of the State is a civil duty, 626; When religion is the controlling force in education, 627; Daniel Webster on the part of religion in education, 628; Other typical Americans speak to the same effect, 629; Strong commendations from a Hebrew—the views of Huxley and Spencer, 631; The Christian religion forms a part of the common law of the land, 632; Religious liberty secured in every State of the Union, 634; In Pennsylvania Catholics must look to themselves alone to support their charities, 635; The New York Protector a model for that proposed by Archbishop Ryan, 636; Elbridge T. Gerry's tribute to the former, 637; Governor Hoyt on the superiority of private benevolent institutions, 639; The Church and the State in their respective spheres, 640.	
<b>SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE.</b> By <i>Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , . . .	641
Precious stones, 641; Gems and jewels—characteristics of precious stones, 642; Cutting, 647; Form of gems, polishing, 648; Engraving, setting, 649; Weight and classification of gems, the individual gems, 650; Some remarkable diamonds, 656; Crown jewels, 658; The United States, 659.	
<b>THE EVOLUTION OF EVOLUTION.</b> By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i> , . . .	673
The modern system of evolution essentially irrational, 673; The change from thirteenth to sixteenth century was decidedly for the worse, 674; The fact not to be explained by a weakening of the Church's spiritual weapons, 675; Physical science widening the gulf between the old and the new systems, 676; Mischief wrought by Descartes and Berkeley, 677; The part that association has played in the evolution of evolution, 678; Kant against Hume, but both equally mischievous, 679; Biological science as a contributor to the result, 680; How a rational theory of evolution must consider the world, 681; Promulgation of Darwin's theory of natural	

	PAGE
selection, 682; The data of Weismann and Haeckel, 683; Haeckel's theory of the primary condition of organic life, 685; Bateson's "Materials for the Study of Organic Organizations," 686; The body of an animal has its own innate laws, 687; Variations in parts which are serially symmetrical, 688; An unfair and exceedingly shallow criticism, 689; The question of discontinuous variation, 690; Structural differences between American and Old-World apes, 691; Darwin's notion of feminine influence on changes, 693; The non-theistic theory of evolution powerless to explain the true nature of the organic world, 694; Non-theistic evolution born in original sin, 695; Preparing the way for views other than those of naturalism, 696; What the true logical system of evolution teaches, 697.	
<b>ROME AND ITS RECENT RUINS.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J.</i> , . . . . .	698
Rome threatened with presenting the spectacle of modern ruins, 698; The steady undermining of social and religious life, 699; The inside and outside views of Rome, 700; How the compiler of the guide-book regards Rome, 701; The present position of imperial Rome, 702; The relation to it of Papal Rome, 703; Superficial view of the number of churches and charities in Rome, 704; Charities that are educational institutions, 705; The confiscations that followed the invasion of 1870, 706; The reason for the great number of churches, 707; And more may be added at any time, 708; The reflection of old heathen Rome, 709; The history of Christian Rome in its monuments, 710; The glory of the friends of God celebrated in shrines, 711; Rome's medieval vicissitudes, 712; Interior life of Rome as manifested in charity and culture, 714; Library treasures of Papal Rome, 715; The personality of the Popes, 716; Firmness of the Papacy in a world of unsteadiness, 717; Dulling the public sense to the enormities of public dishonesty, 718; What is needed to set things right, 719; When will the great injustice that has been done to Rome be righted? 720.	
<b>INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES (CONCLUDING ARTICLE).</b> By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> , . .	721
Summary of preceding articles on Mr. Pilling's work, 721; Algonquian records preserved in manuscript, 722; Scanty remains of New England and Pennsylvania Indians, 723; The first Jesuit missionaries in North America, 725; Commencement of a glorious history, 726; Character of the manuscripts of that time, 727; Algonquian dictionaries, 728; Life of those Catholic missionaries, 729; How they compiled their Indian works, 730; Bishop Baraga and Father Jucker, 732; Names of missionaries positively identified as authors of Indian manuscripts, 733; Description of some of the works, 734; A misleading report on Father Meurin, 736; Father Rasles' Abnaki dictionary, 737; The late Dr. Shea liberally quoted, 738; Maryland Jesuits, 739; Catholic Indian tribes of the West, 740; Cardinal Mezzofanti studied American Indian languages, 741; Algonquian manuscripts in Canada and in the United States, 742; The Jesuits established the first college in North America, 743; The last survivor of a noble band, 744; A valuable collection of missionary lore scattered, 746; The greatest of Mr. Pilling's works kept from being perfect by Mr. Powell, 748; Death of the great compiler, 749.	
<b>LEO XIII. AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH—RECENT WORK IN THE VATICAN LIBRARY.</b> By <i>Rev. E. Soutif, C.S.C.</i> , . . . . .	750
Facilitating the survey of historical questions in France, 750; Value and meaning of the words, "The Archives of the Vatican," 751; Some sample treasures and official Papal records, 752; America well represented, 753; What Pope Leo XIII. has done for historical research, 755; Workers of all shades of opinion in the Vatican Library, 757; What some of them have already done, 758; A vast amount of new and piquant information obtained, 760; The Holy Father increasing as well as opening his treasures, 761; Facilities for using the archives, 762; An appeal for more Americans to be sent to Rome, 764; Real value of the Holy Father's library, 765.	
<b>EDUCATION IN ANCIENT GREECE.</b> By <i>Prof. Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D.</i> , . .	766
What we know of the subject is only a fragment, 766; Greece a country of many states and varied customs, 767; No knowledge of the beginning of Greek schools, 768; The first mention of them in history, 769; What led to their rapid and general spread, 770; Solon's school laws preserved by Æschines, 771; No State provision for a long time except for the Athenian orphans, 772; In later days other towns maintained schools from public funds, 773; Making much of education, but having little respect for the teachers, 774; Salaries of elementary teachers, 776; Where the teacher dispensed his wisdom, 777; A word of the scholars, 778; The Greek husband in politics and at home, 779; How the boys went to school, 780; The men who shaped the youthful mind and heart of Greece, 782; The scholar's occupations, 783; The rod an important factor, 784; Protests against wholesale flogging, 785; The scholar's attempts to become acquainted with the muses, 786; Difficulties in the way of learning to spell and read, 787; Homer not the only reading book, 788; Poetry as a substitute for a catechism of simple morality, 789; Importance of distinct enunciation appreciated, 790; The aim of the lessons in reading and writing, 791; Writing materials, 792; The Greek arithmetic, 793; Music as an aid to morality, piety and patriotism, 795; The hymns and songs taught by the citharist, 796; The lyre the national instrument, 797; Gymnastics in Greek education, 798; Physical culture and athletics, 799; Where gymnastics were taught, 800; Examinations and vacations, 802; Changes effected in educational methods from the Macedonian period, 803; Simplicity of early Greek literary education, 805; Greek education essentially moral, religious and utilitarian, 806.	
<b>JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.</b> By <i>T. L. L. Teeling</i> , . . . . .	807
His parentage, 807; The little that is known of his early life, 808; Educated first at home and then by the Jesuits, 809; At the University of Turin, 810; Living at home in Chambéry as a young lawyer, 811; Elements of the community, 812;	

Joseph de Maistre at one time a Freemason, 818; The Church and the secret society, 814; Chambéry's last pageant of semi-medieval grandeur, 815; This inspired J. de Maistre to write his first book, 817; How he stored his mind with general knowledge, 818; Legal duties not altogether congenial to him, 819; How he approached the state of matrimony, 820; Revolt in Savoy against its king, 821; The province seized by France, and De Maistre becomes an exile, 822; Re-entering political life in Turin, 823; He becomes minister to Russia and expresses his views of the Papacy, etc., 824; His views of Russia and the Russians, 826; He believed in feminine inferiority, 827; But he was always a favorite with distinguished women, 828; The little that is recorded of his faithful wife, 829; It was in St. Petersburg he wrote his best works, 830; Their Russian exile apparently very congenial to the De Maistre family, 831; Count de Maistre returns to Turin—Lamartine's picture of him, 832; Importance of De Maistre's teaching and influence, 834; What some other great Catholic writers owe to him, 835; He advocated a wise liberty, 836; Light thrown on his character by his correspondence, 837; Revival of interest in his works, 838.

**THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN MANITOBA.** By *John S. Ewart, Q.C.*, . . . . . 839

Canadian schools under the Confederation Act of 1837, 839; Formation of the Province of Manitoba, 840; The point on which the present difficulty hinges, 841; A lesson from the conduct of New Brunswick, 843; Religious change in the population of Manitoba, 844; How the present Liberal (?) Ministry came into power, 845; Effect of the Jesuits' Estate Act of Quebec, 846; Opposition to it in Ontario and elsewhere, 847; Passage of the Martin School Act of Manitoba, 848; Its provisions as to religion, 849; The act in the courts, 850; Provisions of the Manitoba Charter, 851; Opinion of the highest court, 852; Difficulty of the Dominion Government's position, 853; The famous order-in-council, 854; The Manitoba Government's reply, 855; The second remedial order-in-council, and objection to it, 856; All that was left for the Dominion Government to do, 857; How the Manitoba school case now stands, 858.

**THE OUTLOOK FOR IRELAND.** By *Bryan J. Clinch*, . . . . . 859

The fate of Irish Home Rule not settled by the recent election, 859; Why autonomy must be granted, 860; The change in the temper of the English people towards Ireland, 861; The Irish question had little to do with Lord Rosebery's fall, 862; Home Rule a live political question in England to-day, 863; It depends most on the Irish people themselves, 864; The non-office-holding rule of the Irish members, 865; Their Parliamentary policy, 866; Importance of complete harmony in the Irish party, 867.

**SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE.** By *Rev. T. J. A. Freeman, S.J.*, . . . . . 885

Precious stones, gems, jewels—II., corundum group, 888; Some large sapphires, 870; Some large rubies, 872; Chrysoberyl group, 873; Spinel group, 874; Topaz and beryl groups, 875; Hyacinth and garnet groups, 878; Tourmaline and quartz groups, 879; Chrysolite, turquoise and opal groups, 882; The pearl group, 883; Famous pearls, 885.

# BOOK NOTICES.

PAGE	PAGE
Acadia : Missing Links of a Lost Chapter, etc. (Richard).....	891
Agnosticism and Religion (Lucas).....	667
A Life's Decision (Allies).....	435
Analysis of the Eutropius, a Greek Drama	895
Bernadette of Lourdes (Pouvillon).....	448
Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics, Vol. IV. (Gillow).....	895
Books and Reading (Brother Azarias).....	444
Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Baltimore (Turner).....	445
Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared (Young).....	421
Catholic Girl in the World (Whyte Aves)	224
Catholic University Bulletin, Washington, D. C. ....	440
Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions (O'Loan).....	448
Characteristics of True Devotion (Grou and Clinton, S. J.).....	224
Christian Faith and the Individual (Allies)	444
Christliche Ikonographie (Detzel).....	446
Compendium Sacre Liturgie Juxta Ritum Romanum (Wapellhorst).....	448
Conferences on the Spiritual Life (De Ravignan).....	671
Curé of Ars (O'Meara).....	447
Das Problem des Leidens in der Moral (Keppler).....	447
Divine Love and the Love of God's Most Blessed Mother (Weld).....	672, 896
Dogmatic Theology, Outlines of (Hunter)	438, 672, 894
Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (MacEvilly).....	217
Flower of the Flock, etc. (Egan).....	224
Formation of Christendom, Vol. I. (Allies)	444
Franzelin, John Baptist, S. J. (Walsh).....	426
From the Greeks to Darwin (Osburn).....	448
Gaelic Journal, Vol. VI. (Dublin).....	223
Geschichte Des Breviers (Baumer).....	896
Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum-Hungaricum in Rom (Steinhuber).....	439
Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes (Jansen and Pastor).....	219
History of St. Philomena (Bowden).....	668
History of the Mass (O'Brien).....	224
History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages (Pastor and Antrobus).....	896
Hygiene, with Anatomy and Physiology (Edwards).....	448
Inner Life of Father Thomas Burke, O. P. Institutiones Philosophicæ (Mandato).....	672
Iroquois and the Jesuits (Donohue).....	438
Jesus, the Good Shepherd (De Goesbriand)	224
Jewish Race in Ancient and Roman History (Rendu).....	896
Journals Kept During Times of Retreat (Morris and Polen).....	448
Leben Unseres Herrn Jesus Christus (Carmus and Keppler).....	447
Legends and Stories of the Holy Child Jesus (Lutz).....	224
Lehre des Joannes Cassianus (Hoch).....	442
Letters of St. Alphonsus M. de Liguori (Grimm).....	448
Let us go to the Holy Table (Lambert).....	224
Life of Bl. John Gabriel Perboyre.....	223
Life of Mary Monholland, Sister of Mercy	224
Little Office of the B. V. and Office of the Dead.....	448
Little Sisters of the Poor (Mrs. Ram).....	224
Loyalty to Church and State (Mgr. Satolli)	670
Magister Choralis (Haberl and Donnelly)	448
Manual of Scripture History (Richards).....	448
Meditations for all the Days of the Year for Priests, etc. (Hamon).....	487
Memoir of Mother Frances Raphael Drane, O. S. D. (Wilberforce).....	887
Muster des Predigers (Schleinfinger).....	896
Mostly Boys (Finn, S. J.).....	224
Office of the Dead and Little Office of the B. V. M. ....	448
Officium Parvum B. M. V. ....	448
Outlines of Dogmatic Theology (Hunter)	438, 672, 894
Patrologia Syriaca (Graffin).....	424
Poetical Works of Lageniensis (Canon O'Hanlon).....	222
Prælectiones Dogmaticæ (Chr. Pesch, S. J.)	220
Psychologia Rationalis (Reeder).....	441
Public School System of the United States	224
Retreat, Consisting of Thirty-three Discourses, with Meditations for the Clergy, etc. (Hedley).....	446
Revealed Religion (Hettinger and Bowden).....	660
Rituale Romanum, Editio quarta.....	896
Sacerdotis Vade Mecum (Andrels).....	448
Sacred Scriptures (The), or the Written Word of God (Humphrey).....	448
Short Instructions in the Art of Singing Plain Chant (Singenberger).....	448
Social Evolution (Kidd).....	663
St. Chantal and the Foundation of the Visitation (Bougaud).....	431
St. Paul and His Missions (Fouard).....	434
Story of Courage (Lathrop).....	215
Students' Handbook of British and American Literature (Jenkins and Viger).....	224
Synopsis Tractatus Scholastici de Deo Uno (Stentrup).....	672
The One Mediator, or Sacrifice and Sacraments (Humphrey).....	448
Things of the Mind (Spalding).....	430
Tour Round My Library, etc. (Comegys).....	672
Tractatus de Deo Uno (De San).....	428
Watches of the Sacred Passion (Gallwey)	445
Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexicon, Part 95.....	447

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XX.—JANUARY, 1895.—No. 77.

---

JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI.

IT was with sincere sorrow that all cultured persons, without distinction of belief or race, heard of the death of this great Christian scholar, whose name and fame were known wherever there was love of letters, or interest in the past of our Christian and Western society. Like Gladstone in politics, or Tennyson and Holmes in literature, he had occupied so long the office of a supreme teacher in his special sciences, that he became almost identified with those branches of human knowledge, and his departure came as an almost irreparable loss, so much did it carry away of erudition, experience and direction, and so large a void did it leave in the hearts of many who loved the man no less than they venerated the scholarly teacher. The writer has been requested by the editor of the REVIEW to furnish an account of this prince of historical archæologists. Willingly would we have left it to a more competent pen and to one whose acquirements and personal knowledge of the *Maestro* amply fit him to proclaim the lesson of this rarely beautiful and productive life. But his firm insistence leaves no loophole of escape, and the following pages are offered as a very imperfect but sincere outline of the life and labors of one of the greatest children of the old Mother Church of Rome.

## I.

John Baptist de Rossi was born at Rome, February 23, 1822, of parents distinguished for station and piety.<sup>1</sup> As a child he loved

---

<sup>1</sup> The biographical items for this sketch of the public career of De Rossi are drawn from the Albums or proceedings of the festivities on the occasions respectively of his  
VOL. XX.—I



to read the lives of the saints, especially of the earlier ones, and satisfied his youthful curiosity by long excursions through an Italian *leggendario*, which happened to contain, what is rare in works of pure piety, some account of the authorities or original sources whence the sketches of the saints were drawn. This may have been the original impulse that turned his mind to critico-historical investigations which became at a very early period an absorbing passion. Speaking in later life of his early days, he was wont to assert that archæology was surely his vocation, since he could not remember that any attraction for other sciences ever asserted itself in him. His studies were made, like those of the other Roman youths, at the Collegio Romano and the Sapienza or Pontifical University. In the former he distinguished himself by aptitude in the study of the classics, never so foreign to the Italian as to the northern mind, and profited no little by the epigraphic instruction of the classic archæologists Secchi and Bonvicini. By a subtle natural instinct he was drawn to the study of epigraphy, for which the materials stared at him from every corner of the old Papal stronghold, and we may date from his early college days the growth of that marvellous insight into the spirit and the rules which governed the ancient Romans in the composition and erection of those multitudinous inscriptions whose marble and bronze relics are forever coming to light beneath the pick of the excavator. At the Sapienza he followed the study of law, more for the sake of the position it furnished than with any thought of living by it, and after an exceptionally brilliant course, in which he was always the leader of his class, was declared, in 1843, *doctor utriusque juris ad honorem*. A mere chance threw him in the way of the famous Mai, and by his influence the young De Rossi was made Scriptor or official copyist to the administration of the Vatican Archives, an office which he held until his death and which enabled him to acquire a valuable acquaintance with a multitude of archæological treasures hidden away most jealously from less fortunate men. In the long years that he spent transcribing, collating and disposing the rare parchments of that unique collection, his extraordinary memory grasped countless indications that aided him afterwards in his peculiar labors among the *rudera* of Christian antiquity. Surely it was the guiding hand of Providence that set the ambitious and ardent youth, not on the tedious and dangerous road of the diplomatic career, but on the sequestered paths that finally led out among the solitudes of the Appian Way and along the deserted banks of Tiber, where her yellow waves gnaw their tortuous

---

sixtieth and seventieth birthdays (1882, 1892) and from the brochure *Giovanni Battista de Rossi, Fondatore della Scienza di Archeologia Sacra, Cenni Biografici*, per P. M. Baumgarten (Rome, 1892).

road to the sea. And, surely, again, it was a disposition of Providence that kept him a lifetime at the official and professional study of the written records of the past, and absolutely forced upon him the conviction that the written documents were to be used *pari passu* with the material monuments, and that the facts of Christian antiquity could never be properly illuminated until the combined light of both was cast upon them.

It would seem that in the family of De Rossi the Catacombs were a frequent subject of conversation, and awakened, almost from infancy, an unquenchable curiosity in the mind of John Baptist. We hear that his father eagerly sought the rare work of Antonio Bosio, "Roma Sotterranea," as a premium for his gifted son, and that the favorite excursion of De Rossi and his brother Michele, when scarcely out of their teens, was out on the lonely wastes of the Campagna, prying around among the entrances to the deserted cemeteries, whither the ancient Christians were tracked like rabbits, or gazing down the *lucernaria* or loopholes that once let in air and light to this subterraneous world, and yet serve as buoys to mark the location of the main pathways across the ocean of ruins that lie beneath. What a fascination there is in this Roman soil! While the grassy mounds and sunken ditches that mark the humble refuges of the early Christian flock were inflaming the piety of the youthful De Rossi, the classical memories of Thræsea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus, of Arnold da Brescia and Cola di Rienzi were firing other Roman youths of the same age. While the genius of De Rossi was planning the discovery of the little Christian communities, those protoplasms around which the mediæval Christendom was one day compacted, hundreds of his companions were conspiring for the violent restoration of that old republic of blood, iron and robbery over whose recent grave the first Christians began their memorable propaganda. In this fated city there goes on forevermore a warfare of the spirit and the flesh, and the passionate outcry and reaction of the conquered world break violently in upon the alleluias and litanies of the Church, even as the hoarse shouts of the pagan rabble sullied the holy purity of the Christian service in the bowels of the Campagna.

It was not without some difficulty that De Rossi obtained his father's consent to the indulgence of these antiquarian tastes, which seemed to promise very poor results, either of fame or advancement. In the end, however, he became the disciple of the Padre Marchi, a well-known Jesuit numismatist, whose discovery of the tomb of Saints Protus and Hyacinthus in the catacomb of St. Agnes, on the Nomentan Way, entitles him to an eminent place in the annals of Christian archæology. Still greater gratitude is owing him for the formation of the young De Rossi, long

his inseparable companion and co-laborer in those sacred mines whose galleries are hallowed by the blood of martyrs innumerable and the pious footfalls of pilgrims still more innumerable, and whose walls are impregnated with the holy aspirations of three great epochs of human culture. Padre Marchi was the last of the old line of Christian archæologists which began at the end of the sixteenth century, with Macarius, Ciacconio, De Winghe and Bosio, was continued in the seventeenth in the persons of Fabretti, Boldetti, Buonarrotti, Lupi, Marangoni and Bottari, and in the early decades of this century was represented in France by De Caumont, Didron, Greppo, Raoul-Rochette, Martin and Cahier, in Germany by Augusti, Binterim and Münter; in Italy by Sarti and Setele. He was the official guardian, or *custode*, of the catacombs, and, as such, inherited much practical knowledge and traditional lore concerning them. He had himself begun a great work on the monuments of early Christian art, of which only one volume was ever published. Political vicissitudes and his own discovery of the qualities of De Rossi made him abandon the work to his young disciple, who had quickly caught the enthusiasm of the old Jesuit, and brought to the holy cause youth, talent, learning, industry, vocation, and the divine intuitions of genius. The world-famous discoveries of De Rossi in the Catacomb of St. Callixtus—those subtle, almost prophetic calculations by which he laid open a vast and intricate city beneath the vineyards and the garden patches of the Roman suburbs, are too well known to need rehearsal here. Suffice it to say that early in the fifties men recognized a new star in the firmament of learning, and that public attention was thenceforth fastened on the young archæologist as one who had struck out a new path, and would soon modify the methods and conclusions of all past workers in Christian archæology. He interested Pius IX. in his work, and obtained the creation of a special commission for the excavations, in which he was ever the guiding spirit and counsel. All his great publications were begun or planned about this time, and the rest of his life devoted to the elevation of his favorite study to the recognized rank of a true science—one of the few which the Catholic Church can say that she has completely won over to her side.

No one was better known in the great archives and libraries of Europe than De Rossi. Since 1853 he visited frequently the principal collections of mediæval manuscripts in Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland and England. The archivists of Berne, Paris, Venice, Milan and many other cities welcomed his visits and threw open their treasures to the one man in Europe who could compare them intelligently with those of the Vatican and make the old parchments give up the mysteries of the past. So

high and unique was his reputation that foreign governments entrusted most precious manuscripts to their representatives at Rome for his use, and deemed themselves honored when he had illustrated their contents or their history. As his fame grew, learned bodies in Europe and America showered honorific titles and memberships on him; orders and crosses and medals were offered for his acceptance; governments, universities and national academies vied with the papacy to do honor to the founder of the new science of Christian Archæology. His name became a household word throughout Christendom as that of the famous wizard who had conjured up before our eyes long-buried cities, and made the men and women of ancient days move as in a mighty kinetoscope. Among all his distinctions the proudest was that of Prefect, or Curator of the Christian Museum attached to the Vatican Library—a life-office created especially for him by Leo XIII., who was no less his friend and admirer than Pius IX. The latter had offered to put him at the head of the Archives after the unfortunate incident of Theiner, but De Rossi, with characteristic modesty and prudence, begged the Pope to permit him to decline.

In 1882 his sixtieth birthday was celebrated with extraordinary enthusiasm, shared equally by kings and republics, by Catholics and non-Catholics. It recalled those splendid coronation scenes of the Renaissance, when the Italian world burst out in spontaneous apotheosis of the poet who best voiced the multitudinous aspirations of its great heart. Only, instead of on the Capitol, men were gathered at the Lateran; instead of a crown of laurel, they offered conviction and gratitude; instead of the perishable allurements of verse and song, they crowned the hard-won victories of a discoverer who had gone out upon a dark and unknown sea, with only the compass of genius, and given back to the Christian world its earliest provinces that the great cleft of the middle times had forced into a well-nigh mythical obscurity. A similar scene was repeated on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, in April, 1892, when his bust was unveiled in the little fourth century basilica of SS. Sixtus and Cæcilia,<sup>1</sup> that rises over the Cata-

---

<sup>1</sup> The bust, of white Serravezza marble, is the work of Luchetti, and is ornamented with the following inscription:

IOHANNI · BAPTISTAE · DE · ROSSI  
 QVO · DVCE · CHRISTIANA · VETVSTAS  
 IN · NOVVM · DECVS · EFFLORVIT  
 PONTIFICVM · HEROVMQVE · PRIMAÆVAE · ECCLESIAE  
 ILLVXERE · TROPHAEA  
 NATALI · EIVS · SEPTVAGESIMO  
 CVLTORES · MARTYRV · ET · SACRAE · ANTIQVITATIS  
 MAGISTRO · OPTIMO · P · A · MDCCCXCII

comb of St. Callixtus, amid the plaudits and congratulations of a large assembly, among which were many representatives of the governments and universities of Europe and of academic bodies and learned societies from both sides of the ocean. The learning of two hemispheres bowed down before the humble and honest Christian investigator, and it sends a thrill of enthusiasm through the coldest veins to think that human science was once more doing homage to a model of Christian faith on the blood-stained floor of St. Callixtus, and that our proud century looked not unsympathetically on this new curving of the altitudes of the human mind beneath the sweet servage of Christ.

In modest and touching language the aged archæologist reviewed his work in the catacombs, and thanked the eminent scholars who had come from afar to greet him, and to console his declining years with approval and acceptance of his labors. There is an echo of the *Nunc Dimittis* in the proud joy with which he referred to his numerous progeny of disciples already equipped for work, and ready to occupy the field when the *Maestro* laid down his arms. Shortly afterwards he was stricken with paralysis, from which his physical frame never recovered, though his intellect remained undimmed to the last. He had reached a green old age, and enjoyed all the honors that could fall to a scholar's lot. He had shed lustre upon the Church of Rome, both as head of the Christian body and as a local community, and caused the name of *Johannes Baptista De Rossi Romanus* to be pronounced everywhere with veneration and respect. The world was better for his labors, and the spirit of peace and conciliation had made much progress by reason of his commanding genius and all-embracing charity. As his strength failed, it was hoped that the country air would revive him, and Castel Gondolfo, the summer residence of the popes, was placed at his disposal by order of Leo XIII. But he never rallied, and on September 20th, he peacefully passed away. His remains were brought back to Rome, and temporarily buried at San Lorenzo. But it is said that a nobler resting place is in store, and that he will be buried in the papal crypt at Saint Callixtus, like a hero on the field of battle. Charlemagne was not more properly entombed beneath the dome of Aix-la-Chapelle, nor Chateaubriand on the wave-beaten rock of St. Malo, than De Rossi will be in the heart of the great Christian cemetery which his genius discovered and rebuilt. He did many difficult things in his life, but nothing to compare with the restoration of *The Cemetery* par excellence, the centre at once of early Christian life at Rome, the nucleus of the landed wealth of the Roman Church, and the mausoleum for a hundred years of her most celebrated pontiffs. He died working, dictating and commenting, like Irish Columba and English

Bede, and his eyes closed upon the pageant of the church militant only to open on that of the church triumphant, whose vicissitudes and memories he had so accurately and piously illustrated upon earth.

*Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos  
In tantum spe tollit avos ; nec Romula quondam  
Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.*

## II.

De Rossi was one of those rare men in whom the entire knowledge of the civilization of the past ages seems to be mirrored, an encyclopædist or polyhistor, to whom the whole range of human thought and endeavor along the lines of intellectual culture was thoroughly familiar. Before the Renaissance such men were rarer still, for, though the mediæval world produced men of great eminence, whose imprint on human society will never fade, it was still an age of action and creation. It had little leisure or capacity for the calm survey of the classic past and its own origins, and perhaps less taste for cultures that were purely pagan, or at least mixed. There was still a touch of the rugged Tertullian in the mediæval Christian. Therefore we cannot class the great archæologist with St. Thomas or St. Bonaventure or Dante. His place is with men like Peiresc, Sirmond, Maffei, Mabillon, Montfaucon, and their congeners. He is not an artist like those who built the cathedrals of Cologne or Strasburg, but like Cellini and Francia, a worker in detail, yet with high ideals, and a definite purpose into which every act of his life fits with perfect neatness and propriety. His writings cover the entire period of Greco-Roman civilization, and he was no less familiar with its pagan than with its Christian side. The Rome of Augustus and the Rome of Damasus and Leo were equally well-known to him. During more than fifty years he gave to the public a multitude of writings, great and small, in which he shed new light on Christian antiquities, on the inscriptions of the ancients, both Greek and Latin, both heathen and Christian ; on the laws, manners and habits of Rome ; on manuscripts and ancient handwriting ; on mediæval art and bibliography. He carried on at the same time a vast system of excavations, organized the Christian Museum of the Lateran, pushed forward the cataloguing of the Vatican archives, and kept a school after the manner of the old philosophers. Indeed, merely to describe intelligently the outlines of his life-work is no easy task, and might well occupy more space than is at the disposal of the writer. Still by classifying the numerous works of his pen we may hope to present something like a fair general view of his enormous literary activity.

De Rossi was pre-eminently an epigraphist. The science of in-

scriptions was his first love; out of his devotion to the *monumenta litterata* sprang all his other researches, and to them were finally referred his most striking conquests in the domain of antiquity. Inscriptions engraved, painted, scratched or stamped; pagan and Christian, public-historical, domestic, and artistic; on stone, bronze, ivory, wood or copper; on buildings, coins, or antiquarian objects; whether found on the original materials, patiently gathered from the printed works of the ancients, or dug out of old mediæval collections, he was first in every department, and labored in all with equal intelligence, devotion, and success. Epigraphy, which was formerly but an ancillary science to history, and an armory of apologetic weapons to the Christian, became in his hands an independent study, with proper and peculiar methods, principles, and conclusions of value for themselves.

The passion of inscriptions has been always strong among powerful and cultured peoples, as the modern discoveries in Assyria, Egypt, Persia, and India abundantly testify. Inscriptions were the heralds of Hellenism in its day of pride, as they are to-day the witnesses of the range of its influence. But never were they more numerous than in the palmy days of imperial Rome, when they stared at the citizen from the arches and the statues of the *fora*, and looked down on him from a hundred basilicas and temples in every city of the mighty East-West world. The walls, the roads, the aqueducts; the boundaries of domains, public and private; the seats in the theatres, the weights and measures, the weapons and curios; the rough marble in blocks and the tiles on the roofs—every material object of public or private life, afforded a space, great or small, to the insatiable "man of letters." Public acts, like treaties, alliances, plebiscita, law-edicts, senatus-consulta, and imperial constitutions, were eternalized in bronze while private transactions were preserved with no less care on durable material, as the banker's accounts, the rent rolls, the tavern bills and political manifestoes of Pompeii show us. Sometimes whole annals or biographies were written out on stone, as we see by the Parian *Marmorchronik* and the famous *Monumentum Ancyranum*. Only one familiar with the texts and details of early imperial history can imagine what a multitudinous mass of inscriptions must have existed intact before the downfall of the ancient culture. But they perished miserably at the hands of those two great enemies of human achievements, cruel man and relentless time. One ground them into the earth, and the other swept away all reminiscences of their ancient estate, so that the same silent desolation spread over those relics of Roman greatness which Rome herself had so often brought upon the greatness of older civilizations than her own. Still they did not perish unheeded.

For various reasons the ancients, especially the refined *literati* of Alexandria, made collections of inscriptions, and such useful and pious labors were carried on by Latin scholars, both pagan and Christian. There are the clearest evidences that such mixed *Corpora* of epigraphical material existed in the West in the fifth and sixth centuries, and that they were favorite books for the compilers of epigrams, and the writers of funeral, sacred, or honorary inscriptions. They contained careful transcriptions of many old epigraphs in elegiac, lyric or epic metre. Often the original lettering was accurately reproduced, and the precious chronological notes, or indices of the time when the original was executed were preserved. But even this bridge was in time broken down, and those priceless early collections are represented to us now by manuscripts of the Carolingian epoch, chiefly pilgrim books or itineraries of wandering monks and travelers, who jotted down among other miscellanea out of the older *Corpora*, then worn, decayed, or neglected, such ancient Latin inscriptions as were likely to be of use or interest in their own little circles beyond the Alps.

The merest chance has preserved to us a very few specimens of this literary work in manuscripts that belonged originally to Einsiedeln, Lorsch, Milan, Klosterneuburg, Gottweich, Verdun, etc. Their text is now corrupt; there are great breaks in them; they are often mutilated, and in the worst possible condition; but they are the invaluable link that connects the modern science of Christian epigraphy with the past, while they are also of importance for the history of the collection of Latin inscriptions in general. It is well known that between the Renaissance of Charlemagne and the Italian Renaissance little or nothing was done for the preservation of the old inscriptions, which cast such rare light on the history, literature, and manners of the society that set them in place. A few names shine out, relieving this long neglect: Rienzi, Poggio Bracciolini, the wonderful Ciriaco di Ancona, and his counterpart in devotion to Christian epigraphy, Petrus Sabinus. But with the Italian Renaissance came an astonishing, if excessive and harmful, awakening of piety towards the old classic world. Its smallest relics and fragments were collected and commented on with a sacred enthusiasm. Humanists and travellers, states and cities, popes and kings, and little potentates, collected personally or by commission great numbers of inscriptions, chiefly Latin, and arranged for public or private use, a new kind of museum, the lapidary galleries of the Renaissance. The sixteenth century saw the local gatherers at work, and also the first attempt at a printed collection made by the humanist, Conrad Peutinger, whose name remains attached to one of the most curious documents of antiquity—the *Tabula Peutingerii*, or road map of the Roman Empire. Bankers like the Fug-



gers, and rulers like Charles V., and Frederick of Austria, caught the contagion, and from that time the collection of inscriptions has gone on with almost unabated vigor. Until very recently a strict line of demarcation was not made by collectors between the Pagan and the Christian. Previous to this century, however, the former owe most to the zeal of Apians, Martin Smetius, Scaliger, Muratori, Maffei, and many others too numerous to mention, while the latter owe a deep debt of gratitude to such men as Bosio, Gruter, Sirmond, Doni, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Suaresius, Gori, Zaccaria, Marini, and Mai, and to the different *custodi* of the catacombs in the eighteenth century.

In the first half of this century Marini, Mai, and Borghesi sustained the honor of the Italian name in the science of epigraphy, but their light pales before that of De Rossi, in whom occasion, genius, industry, and vocation conspired to produce the greatest epigraphist of all time, though he would himself be the last to deny his debt to the great workers who preceded him, and of whose printed and unprinted collections he made such constant use. It is totally foreign to our purpose to present here the results of his labors as an epigraphist; let it suffice that we give a brief account of the two great works in which can most easily be seen specimens of his peculiar talent and monuments of his industry, the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and the *Inscriptiones Christianæ*. The former work was often begun in previous centuries, but as often abandoned. In time the French Academy put its hand to the work of collecting all the Latin inscriptions of antiquity, but owing to untoward circumstances, laid it aside. Finally the Royal Academy of Berlin took up the difficult task and has carried it on well nigh to completion.<sup>1</sup> Early in the fifties it made a formal application to De Rossi for aid in the work, and with the permission and encouragement of the Vatican authorities, he consented. Together with Henzen he edited the sixth volume of the *Corpus*, containing the Pagan or non-Christian inscriptions of Rome and Latium, and personally made many learned contributions to the entire work. His knowledge of the manuscript collections of inscriptions was of the greatest service at all times, as well as his free access to the Vatican archives, his familiarity with the topography of Rome and the suburbs, and his fine scent in reconstructing, which was the real secret of his genius.

It is not enough to know where the old inscriptions are, in what galleries, museums, archives, books and manuscripts the originals, whole or fragmentary, and their copies are to be found. Nor is it

---

<sup>1</sup> *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum regie Borussicæ editum, Berolinii, in folio, vol. i.-xv., 1863-1885.*

enough to read the language of the marbles and the bronzes with ease and intelligence. For a great epigraphist it requires something more. Much of the material has come down to us in a very imperfect shape, broken, disjointed, scattered, like the shreds of a letter thrown to the winds. Then there are the forgeries and the interpolations or mutilations to guard against, and the transcription errors of ancient copyists to correct. There are imperfect lines to piece out at the beginning or the end, and words to supply in the context, all of which must be done within certain narrow limits of space or grammar. There are the frequent abbreviations, never quite the same, even in epochs that follow closely upon one another. The magistracy, the law formulas, the military service, the priest-hoods and the sepulchral system have each their peculiar *sigla* or *litterae singulares*, by which commonly recurring notions are most easily expressed. And when all this is mastered, when the text is finally restored, and we can read at last what men once found worthy to say of themselves and their deeds, only a small part of the task is accomplished. There must come a teacher who shall interpret all this, and drawing upon an almost limitless treasure of philological, literary, historical and artistic lore, cause the cold marble and the hard bronze to speak, and give up the secrets of the men who erected them. The epigraphist must be archæologist at once and antiquarian, lawyer and philosopher, and be equally at home in the palace and the forum, among the soldiery and the priests, as in the wine shops of the Suburra and among the motley crowd that surges along the wharves of Tiber. No detail of ancient life, public or private, is useless to him, and out of his enormous collection of facts and observations and readings, he is forever drawing the items needed to strengthen a hypothesis or to weld together some long chain of reasoning.

It was precisely here that the wide classical reading of De Rossi, his fine memory and his systematic arrangement of notes, came to his aid, and enabled him to illustrate his epigraphic texts with a truly marvellous wealth of apposite citations, out of which, again, he knew how to draw the most striking lights upon the question at issue. His profound knowledge of the patristic texts was also of great help to him, since much of the old classic life and thought is embedded in them. But his superiority to most others lay in two things: the application of the geographical method to the study of the inscriptions, and the skill with which he used every contemporary document of any nature whatsoever when engaged on a text. Quite early in the Renaissance the wise idea had made its way that the inscriptions ought to be arranged in geographical families; *i.e.*, that they ought to be restored as much as possible to those conditions of time and space in which they

arose, so as to enable us to hear their natural interpreters—the contemporary and local history, language and manners—and to reconstruct the actual surroundings of these dumb witnesses of antiquity, that have, indeed, a voice, but for which an artificial throat and an artificial atmosphere must be prepared ere we can hear its tones. As early as 1842 De Rossi had proposed a return to this system in almost the first work of his juvenile pen, and he lived to see it triumphant in one of the noblest works that have issued from the brain of man, and which includes over one hundred and fifty thousand inscriptions, illustrating, with rarest accuracy, the history of Rome from the earliest days, when the treaty with Gabii was painted on shields of bull's hide, down to the hour when the kingly Goth sat as master on the Capitol, and bade his brother barbarians spare the records of their fallen ruler.<sup>1</sup>

### III.

I turn with pleasure to the *Inscriptiones Christianæ*, in which the second of De Rossi's great epigraphical merits is best illustrated. After all, the classical world is fairly well known and much of its literature has reached us. Its monuments are widely scattered and tell their own story very often. Occasionally entire sections come to the surface, as in Algiers and in Rome itself. Finally, in the popular memory there lives no small share of intelligence of the spirit and the deeds of ancient Rome and her subject world. How different is it with the history of Christianity within the same limits of time! In literature we can boast only of a collection of fragments, precious beyond imagination, but which are only a tithe of what once was, and are oftener the voice of defence and apology than of calm, full exposition of belief. Of monuments, until De Rossi arose, there was the greatest dearth, and among Christians the continuity of race and culture and habitat has been so often broken that outside of the Church herself we cannot look for any vivid consciousness of the remote past. Over the history of the early Church there lies a deep twilight, out of which there loom, vague and indistinct, a few figures and situations. The want of an honest, synthetic view of those primitive days was not felt while the Christian unity was unbroken, but in the last three centuries no lost art has been more keenly deplored than the knowledge of the life and manners of the early Christian world. The value of the inscription was always recognized. They were, in fact, one of the earliest forms of Christian literary effort, and the *titulus* put up to St. James of Jerusalem, and the inscribed group of the Hæmorrhøissa, at Paneas, have a

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Waltzing: *Le recueil general des Inscriptions latines, et l'épigraphie latine depuis cinquante ans.* Louvain, 1892.

claim on our veneration only less than that due to the earliest literary remains of the post-apostolic age.<sup>1</sup>

There seem to have been collections of Christian inscriptions and epigrams before the peace of the Church, and the fact is quite certain for the fourth and fifth centuries. The pious travellers of the Carolingian age preserved much of the material of these old collections, and for a long time their parchments, together with the writings of men like Venantius Fortunatus, Isidore of Seville, Alcuin, and others like Hibernicus Exul, Sedulius Scotus and the monks of Bobbio, were the only literary sources whence a knowledge of Christian inscriptions could be got. There were the churches, it is true, and the sepulchres of martyrs and confessors and holy bishops and popes; there was also a multitude of inscribed objects over the whole Christian world, but who could visit them all? Outside of a few in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Rome and a larger number in its namesake of Ravenna, we know of no attempt to collect even the epitaphs of a series of bishops. In the later Middle Ages the collecting of Christian inscriptions and epitaphs was almost utterly neglected. Here and there in the annals or chronicles of the time occasional reference is made to inscriptions or epitaphs, but on the whole the science was utterly neglected, though the use of inscriptions was by no means diminished. Not all the chiefs of the Italian Renaissance were pagan-minded. From its opening some attention was paid to the collecting and commenting of the ancient Christian inscriptions that fell well within the limits of the classic age. Not to speak of earlier attempts, we have large and valuable collections made at the end of the fifteenth century by Ciriaco di Ancona and Peter Sabinus. Among the great names of the counter-reformation, that of Antonio Bosio must always be held in honor, not alone for his rediscovery of a world of ancient theological evidence, but for his great zeal in copying and collecting all the old Christian inscriptions that he came across. Others followed him, like Doni, Gori, Muratori, Maffei and Marini, gathering mostly the inscriptions to be found above ground, only rarely adding from the vast stock of those that lay mouldering beneath their feet. It was among these men that appeared the idea of a *Corpus* of Christian inscriptions which should illustrate the ancient Christian life and serve as a weapon of polemic and apologetic warfare. Often planned and begun, it was abandoned as often as the similar enterprise in the province of heathen inscriptions, until the proper man came in the person of De Rossi.

The finest epigraphical training on Roman soil, an accurate

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Piper: *Einleitung in die monumentale Theologie*. Gotha, 1867.

knowledge of Roman topography and of the contents of every Roman gallery and collection, public or private, a consuming passion to piece together the splendid mosaic of the old Christian life, intelligent piety toward the very dust of antiquity, a patient, orderly, persevering mind, a vocation cherished by his earliest surroundings, and a special gift of divination, or moments of lightning-like introspection, in which the *disjecta membra* that lay before him took shape beneath his prophetic glance ere they vanished again into quasi-nothingness, like the old *lucumones* beneath the glaring eye of an Etruscan sun,—such were some of the qualities that this young man of twenty brought to the herculean task that he planned, in part executed, and for the completion of which he has left the materials numbered and ordered like the great blocks of some unfinished Roman palace that encumber even yet the old marble Emporium by the Tiber.

In the science of Christian inscriptions De Rossi towers above all his predecessors by the knowledge of the sources and the superiority of his system. Under his direction the Roman Catacombs have yielded thousands of inscriptions, whole or fragmentary, and the sum of Christian epigraphic material has been more than doubled. He has himself visited innumerable sites above and below ground, and carefully copied the epitaphs, epigrams, dedications, and the like that are found there. The manuscript collections of Christian inscriptions have been catalogued by his skillful hand, numbered according to age and value, their additions to the body of inscriptions noted, and a great deal of valuable incidental information extracted from them for the formation and guidance of the Christian epigraphist. At the same time he was distinguished for his knowledge of all books, museums, correspondence, and men who could in any way throw light on his science. In other words, he had completely mastered the *heuretic* of Christian inscriptions; that is, he had surveyed the world of letters, located the whereabouts of his material and mapped out the roads and the paths that led to them. Precisely here is the other great merit of De Rossi as an epigraphist. He was a man of method. Not only did he make the most arduous preparations, remote and proximate, for his work, but he invented new principles of procedure, or rehabilitated old ones fallen into desuetude. When we watch the splendid—almost infallible—skill with which he conducts his epigraphic demonstrations, the studied moderation of every claim until conviction bursts spontaneous from the artful page, the marshalling of every available help, and the broad, serried march of all that sum of fact, suggestion, comparison and parallel—a sentiment of wonder clamors for expression, and we cry out, with the poet, that the art is even greater than the artist.

If chronology and geology are the eyes of history, they are especially serviceable in the science of inscriptions, which are necessarily laconic, compressed, and general in their speech. In the classic inscriptions the data of time and place are very often given, or, because of their great numbers and artistic perfection, can be calculated from extrinsic and intrinsic comparison. But such means of control are too often wanting in the case of Christian inscriptions, especially of the earlier times. They are rude in execution, long since torn from their surroundings, or scattered amid wreckage of every kind in the Catacombs. They are comparatively few, and rarely bear any chronological ear marks. Many a primitive Christian believed that this world *in maligno positus* was to be of short duration, and that human existence was, at best, but the *mora finis*, a beneficent staying of the divine hand uplifted to strike an unholy mass of corruption. The enthusiasm of Jesus Christ burned fresh, vivid, and sweet in their breasts, and they longed to be joined with Him whose remembrance alone made tolerable their life amid the seething sin and shame of heathen society. Hence they paid little attention to the aids of human chronology. With their eyes fixed on the celestial bourne, they counted the beginning of life to be the day of release from the prison of the flesh, and there is an echo of that other-world enthusiasm in many ancient acts of the martyrs that begin with *Regnante Domino nostro Jesu Christo*, as though they despised any other pitiful human measure of time. "*Qui sæculo nuntiasset se meminisset*," says St. Cyprian, "*nullum sæculi diem novit, nec tempora terrena jam computat qui aeternitatem de Deo sperat*." On the other hand, the theological and social value of the Christian inscriptions depends largely on their age, and we are most anxious to know precisely those little items of years, months and days to which the primitive Christian was so indifferent. Much had been done before De Rossi by earlier Christian epigraphists, but he summed up and greatly increased their results in the first volume of the *Inscriptiones Christianae*.<sup>1</sup> There he submitted nearly fourteen hundred inscriptions, that bear some kind of a date (*nota temporis*), to a rigorous external and internal examination, from the famous Latin tablet of A.D. 71, down to epitaphs and epigrams of the end of the sixth century, the *terminus ad quem* of his great collection. In every case he develops the grave arguments that lead him to attribute a Christian character to the inscription before him and to assign it to a fixed year of the Christian Era. In his restitution of the text and in his rich commentary he displays on every

---

<sup>1</sup> *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romæ Septimo Sæculo Antiquiores*. Romæ, in folio, vol. i, 1861; vol. ii., part i, 1888.

page the qualities that ever distinguished him as an epigraphical writer—patient compilation of all the facts, orderly distribution according to immediate importance, vast reading, out of which he drew the newest and aptest parallels and luminous comparisons—those peculiar arguments which are to archæology what the syllogism is to metaphysics. So skillful is the demonstration, so perfect the distribution of lights and shades, so modest the claims for his victorious proofs, that one is tempted to fear that he is being influenced by a kind of personal magic on the part of his author and that he reads through a charmed haze in which objects have no longer their right proportion or color. Only, the amount of the new knowledge, the exactness of the references, the deference paid the writer by great masters of his own art, the natural persuasion of his argument, even his translucent Latin style, that reflects the noble candor of his soul, dispel the impression that such superiority not unnaturally awakens. The first volume of this monumental work contains, besides a long preface on the history of the collections of Christian inscriptions, an exhaustive treatise on the chronological data furnished by the inscribed monuments of Christianity, the eras, the *fasti consulares*, the cycles, solar and lunar, and the indications. In this masterpiece of difficult erudition he brings together from all sides, whatever may illustrate the use of these data, not only among Christians but in the surrounding society, and leaves a secure foundation for the labors of all future scholars among these *disjecta membra* of Christian antiquity. The plan of this great work includes all the inscriptions of the *Orbis Christianus* within the first six centuries of our era, taking them as the period when Christianity was co-equal with Græco-Roman culture. In the execution of this plan three dominant ideas are constantly kept in view, viz., the restoration of the inscriptions to their original sites, their chronological sequence, and the apologetic, theological or antiquarian use to be derived from them. To satisfy at once the demands of his science and the natural curiosity of the Christian world, he divides his collection into six great parts: I. The inscriptions bearing a certain date (this is the only part finished, and contains some 1374 inscriptions, besides fragments and addenda). II. The public-historical and sacred inscriptions, and all others which throw light on the doctrine, manners, etc., of the early Christians. III. The inscriptions arranged in geographical and topographical order, by nations, provinces, cities and cemeteries. IV. Those whose original location is unknown. V. The forged inscriptions and those whose early Christian origin is doubtful. VI. The contemporary inscriptions of the Jews. No doubt much of this vast plan work was finished by the *Maestro* ere he died, but as yet only two huge folios, the first volume and the

first part of the second, have appeared. We have already outlined the contents of the initial volume. The published part of the second is entirely taken up with an account of the mediæval manuscript collections of Christian inscriptions. Some of these MSS. date from the Carolingian era, and are sources of incalculable value, not only for the epitaphs, honorary inscriptions and other epigrammata they contain, but also for their topographical references to the ancient basilicas, cemeteries and localities of general interest to Christian pilgrims at Rome. They complete or explain the information already gained from the Catacombs or the lapidary galleries, and are themselves illustrated and perfected by the metrical anthologies of the same epoch.

Our Irish forefathers were foremost in the mania for these written remnants of antiquity, and no small part of ancient Christian inscriptional verse is found embedded in the metrical epigrams of Hibernicus Exul, Sedulius Scotus, the seventh century monks of Bobbio and others. In this volume we find printed or reprinted a great *corpus* of old manuscript codices from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries, in which is preserved much epigraphic material otherwise unknown or lost, and which represent the mediæval tradition of this science. These ancient manuscripts needed, indeed, to be reproduced at the head of the second part of the *Inscriptiones Christianae*, that the world might see what was already known of early Christian inscriptions ere the witnesses of the stones themselves was heard. It was all the more necessary, as too often the lapidary remains are mutilated and can only be pieced out by comparison with their ancient copies yet extant in the manuscripts, or with similar materials scattered through the Carolingian anthologies and itineraries. Only the epigraphists and the intimate friends of De Rossi know what labors this second volume exacted—how many long journeys, vigils, protracted studies and profound researches it cost to erect this vestibule of the temple of Christian epigraphy, truly grandiose and faultless in its outline. By far the greater part of the material contained in the ancient collections is metrical; hence the utility of the long preface on Christian metrical inscriptions which opens the second volume, and makes a most scholarly page on the origins of Christian poetry. For their models the primitive Christian had the great schoolbook of the empire—the divine Virgil, and more than one fine *cento*, thoroughly Christian in sentiment, was made up of odds and ends of the Mantuan. Not all the Christians were satisfied with such unadorned expressions of emotion as were conveyed by the *soror carissima, filia dulcissima, vivas in Deo*, etc. Some ambitioned a more resounding phrase, and borrowed with national piety the grave religious lines of their own pure poet, who was able, even after another thousand years,



to furnish thoughts and style to a Dante. That the Greek Christians showed metrical skill in their inscriptions is proven by several examples, notably by the epitaphs of Alexander Antonii, of Pectorius of Autun, and by the now famous Vatican epitaph of Abercius of Hieropolis, in Phrygia. The latter memorial brings us back to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and shows us a section of the Roman world in the second century, where the Christians could fearlessly put up their funeral tablets by the roadside in a populous province and invoke the protection of Roman law for their immunity. The Christian use of *tituli rhythmici* at Rome and in Roman Africa during the third century is proven from texts pilfered out of Commodian and from the epitaph of the virgin Severa set up at Rome by her deacon-brother Severus. After the peace of the Church the art of the epigraphist was in honor, and the rude scratchings of the fossor gave way to the elegant lettering of a Furius Dionysius Philocalus, while the brief, endearing terms and the touching hatchments of the primitive loculi were cast into the shade by the sculptured sarcophagus and the florid piety of its engraved verse. The flowers of Christian poesy were now cultivated by men like St. Damasus, St. Paulinus of Nola, St. Gregory Nazianzen and Prudentius, and their sweet petals scattered over the graves of the dead. The cruel discipline of persecution was at last relaxed and somewhat of earthly attachment makes itself visible in the gentle, loquacious melancholy of these pious epitaphs. Soon they become the rage, and Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of the *naeniae epitaphistarum* as though the art was being overdone. In spite of the decay of letters it lived on, and the literary remains of men like Venantius Fortunatus, Ennodius and Arator explain the elegance of such sixth century epitaphs as those of Accia Maria Tulliana, and of the Anicii in old St. Peter's. But the Time of Ignorance came for the peninsula in the seventh and eighth centuries, when the skill of making ordinary Latin verse was lost, and even the Roman Church was satisfied with a rude and heavy prose, while the care of the old metrical traditions was abandoned to the barbarians of Spain, Ireland, England and Gaul. Isidore and Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin, Dungal, Shiel of Liège, and the men of Bobbio, Hrabanus and Florus, and the Goth Theodulf, enshrine in their writings a mass of ancient Christian epitaphs, whole and fragmentary, sacred and mixed. So constant, indeed, is their use of earlier metrical materials out of epigrams, epitaphs and the like, that it is not easy to say when their verse is native inspiration and when it is borrowed from some metrical collection of the fifth century, or some scrapbook of a pilgrim just returned from his round of the holy places of Italy and the Orient.

## IV.

The name of De Rossi is inseparably connected with the Roman Catacombs. For fifty years he labored in their depths with holy enthusiasm and rare intelligence. Under his directions the excavations took on a new character, and their results were shortly such as almost to justify the assertion that a new science had been created, and to rehabilitate a long-neglected branch of Christian learning. He was not the discoverer of the underground cemeteries of Rome: long before him, since the close of the sixteenth century, the whereabouts of many was known to the Roman authorities and the learned world. Still earlier, the long neglect of these venerable burial places had been broken in the fourteenth century by odd visits of pious friars, and in the fifteenth by the surreptitious meetings of members of the semi-pagan Roman Academy. Early in the seventeenth century they found a choice spirit capable of illustrating their mysteries and shrewd enough to seize the proper principles for the study of this great complexus of graveyards, in which time and man had worked almost irreparable havoc. This was Antonio Bosio, a Roman priest of Maltese birth, who devoted thirty-six years of his life to reconnoitering the location, number and monuments of the Catacombs. His great work, *Roma Sotterranea*, was not published till after his death, in 1632-34, and though it created much talk in the world of antiquarians and theologians, there arose no second Bosio to complete the task until the advent of De Rossi. In the meantime relic-hunters and curio-seekers travelled the huge network in every direction, without intelligence or sympathy for the architecture and the paintings, and did unspeakable harm by their reckless excavations and by their neglect to chronicle intelligently what they met with. The catacombs were treated as a huge quarry. Priceless inscriptions were taken away in cartloads and sawed into slabs to pave the Roman churches or inserted in the walls of private houses. Even as late as the early part of this century men like Marini could see epitaphs taken from the most celebrated crypts, without asking the excavators for any further details. The corridors, or *ambulacra*, were broken down and clogged up; the *lucernaria*, or shafts for light and air, were choked from above with refuse; rich material treasures disappeared without leaving any trace; the frescoes were detached from their original site, and perished in the transit to the upper air. Nearly every indignity was offered to these holy places in which a Damasus feared to repose even in death. The *custodi* of the last two centuries, and the learned Romans of the early part of this, were active and practical men who spent much time in the old cemeteries, but were chiefly taken up with the research of material for polemics or apologetics

or for minor objects of antiquarian interest. Even Padre Marchi, the guide and preceptor of De Rossi, was slow to adopt the new methods which this young man of genius urged on him from 1842.

The method of De Rossi was so simple that we wonder to-day how it did not suggest itself at a much earlier date. It consists in two things—topography and chronology. It was his habit to locate first, with certain helps at his command, the principal cemeteries usually situate along the old Roman roads leading out from the city like the spokes of a wheel. When he had done this, he looked up their history in the books, manuscripts and traditions at his command. Knowing their site and their history, his next object was to find the historical crypts or the great chambers in which the most illustrious martyrs were buried and venerated. There was a double reason for this, since, on the one hand, they were the keys to each necropolis, the subterranean *fora* to and from which all corridors finally led; on the other, they were most likely to contain entire the booty of epitaphs, paintings, sculptures, etc., for which he was likewise searching. It was a kind of mimic warfare, in which he directed his first efforts to the capture of the enemy's citadel and chief treasures. Once in a historical crypt, he made the most perfect inventory of its structure, the objects found, and of the process by which he got there. Nothing escaped his practiced eye, which read books written largely on walls and floors, where the ordinary observer stumbled or tripped at every step. His inventory made, he turned to a series of valuable documents come down from the Middle Ages, and found, invariably, new light upon the fragments of Christian antiquity that he had so patiently dug up out of the bowels of the earth. Little by little he connected the great crypts, drew up the plan of the connecting corridors, located the staircases that led from one floor of the cemetery to another, fixed the limits of the original burying-place and the successive additions and modifications, gained the old and the new levels, determined the relative situation of the whole underground structure, with the little churches or basilicas and sepulchres constructed immediately above ground, and took note of the geological formation.<sup>1</sup> It is easier to imagine than to describe the patience, memory, skill, erudition and self-command needed to carry on at once all these minor lines of one great plan. Whatever may be the difficulties of excavation in the open air, they are vastly increased when the work is carried on

---

<sup>1</sup> Michele de Rossi, the brother of the archæologist, deserves most honorable mention whenever the latter is named. He was for fifty years an invaluable helper to his brother in all things pertaining to the geology, engineering, and architecture of the catacombs.

beneath the surface, where want of room, light, and fresh air are only the least of the obstacles, and not to be compared with the difficulty of control of workers and objects, the ease with which valuable indications may be skipped, and the constant fear lest the roofs sag, or sudden pits open up, or a ruined wall slide across the toilsome path of the fossor. Only half his work was done when the topography of a cemetery lay before his eyes pretty much as it looked when the traveller from the Orontes met the pilgrim from the Thames or the Liffey on the marble stairways that led from the richly-decorated over-ground basilica to the chief crypts, where lay the embalmed bodies of popes and martyrs, shrouded in gold brocade, entombed in marble sarcophagi, and surrounded by hundreds of venerators, amid the blaze of candles and the grave, sweet chant of the litanies. There was an equally difficult task to perform in fixing the respective dates to which all these things belonged. Independently of theological interests, there was a pressing scientific need that the chronology of the architecture and the art of the catacombs should be accurately determined. Before De Rossi, Bosio had grasped the idea that a true thread in this labyrinth was a correct notion of its topography, and De Rossi acknowledges this with that grateful delight which he always manifests when he can do honor to Bosio's judgment. But to De Rossi alone belongs the merit of fixing a certain chronology for the internal evolution of the cemetery system of Christian Rome. The principle of this chronology is set forth in the first volume of the "*Inscriptiones Christianæ*," and consists largely in the process *de notis ad ignota*. He collected the epitaphs that bore a certain date, and noted all their peculiarities. Hence he had a starting-point for similar epitaphs undated, and a first means of determining whether the crypt in which they were found dated from the second or the sixth century. The inscribed monuments thus classified enabled him to fix approximately the date of the paintings and sculptures on which they are often found, and with which they are often contemporary. The excavations and constructions of the catacombs could also be dated in the same way, since there is naturally the closest relations of time between them and the objects for which they were carried on. Another principle of his chronological method was the restitution, as far as possible, to their original sites, of all the ornaments and epitaphs that once decorated them. This gave him a *point d'appui* for the age of the corridor or crypt, surely as old or older than the monuments found in it. In such intricate and delicate processes the investigator can neglect nothing found on the premises or extracted from a certain class of ancient authors and traditions. Hence the extreme minuteness of the chronological demonstra-

tions of De Rossi. At this remoteness from the early Christian world, and at those depths in the earth, the student is like the traveller lost in the primeval forest, to whom every ray and sound and motion, however faint, are welcome helps. Moreover, he felt that he would never live to finish his great work, and he chose to leave the most elaborate examples of his method for the instructions of his disciples and as a fund of suggestions useful to future archæologists. Finally, he was an artist in antiquarian work, and he delighted in conquering the difficulties of some obscure date, and in unravelling with finished skill the last intricacies of a knot that lay unopened for centuries.

One charm of De Rossi's writings on the old Christian cemeteries is the skill with which he conducts his investigation on two lines—one the description of the actual condition and the remaining monuments of the cemeteries, and the other the use of a number of old documents, out of which, as out of a magician's hat, he seems to draw an infinity of useful facts that corroborate or illustrate, or fill up crevices and breaks, or serve as guides and finger-posts or danger signals—in a word, are a kind of a *vade mecum*, or familiar demon, which help him out of every tangle. The tombs of the martyrs, and especially the illustrious ones of Rome, excited deep interest from the earliest days. If the statement of the *Liber Pontificalis*—that Anacletus built a *memoria*, or little chapel, over the body of his predecessor, St. Peter—is not absolutely reliable, no one can gainsay the second century Roman priest, Gaius, when he shows us the public sepulchres of St. Peter and St. Paul, one on the Ostian way and the other *in Vaticano*.

We believe that there was a Christian cemetery in the latter place from the very beginning, and that a future time will show some illustrious Christian dead gathered round Peter and Linus and Anacletus under the bronze columns and the matchless dome of the modern basilica. The Roman Church had twenty-four or twenty-five underground cemeteries at the end of the third century—one for every ecclesiastical division or quasi-parish—and no doubt there was a list of them, their administration and expenses, as exact as that kept fifty years earlier by St. Cornelius for his priests, his poor, his widows and orphans. So systematic and precise, so easily bureaucratic is the Roman mind, that it is impossible to conceive that church at any date without archives, catalogues, lists and all the administrative paraphernalia of a governing body. The persecution of Diocletian burst like a prairie-fire over the Roman Church, and when she emerged, early in the fourth century, there was scarcely a stick of wood or a scrap of writing that remained. In the first three centuries the longest pontifical vacancy was about one year, during the persecution of

Decius. This time the See of Rome seems to have been vacant for six years, nor do we find any traces of that presbyteral government which took charge of church affairs in the time of Decius. There is, therefore, but the faintest hope that any new documents will ever turn up to illustrate the pre-Constantinian period of the ancient cemeteries of Rome. Their place is taken, necessarily, by later martyrologies, calendars, acts of the martyrs, writings of Popes, historico liturgical books of the Roman Church, and by old topographies and itineraries come down to us from the Carolingian epoch. Among the old martyrologies the most famous is that known as the Martyrology of St. Jerome (*Martyrologium Hieronymianum*). In its present shape it comes to us from Auxerre, in France, where it underwent a thorough remodelling in the sixth century. But it is older than that, and is surely an Italian compilation of the fifth century, out of rare and reliable documents furnished by the churches of Rome, Africa, Palestine, Egypt and the Orient. No martyrology contains so many names and indications of saints and martyrs of a very early period, and it is of especial value for the study of the catacombs, because it very frequently gives the roads and the cemeteries where they were buried and venerated in the fifth century, while the cemeteries were yet intact. By dint of transcription, however, and through the neglect or ignorance of copyists, the text has become in many places hopelessly corrupt, and the restitution of its dates, and local and personal indications has been one of the hardest crosses of ancient and modern church archæologists. Besides its very ancient notices of the cemeteries, this martyrology is of great value as embodying a catalogue of martyrs and basilicas of Rome that surely goes back to the early part of the fifth century, and perhaps a third-century catalogue of the Roman Pontiffs.<sup>1</sup> Several other martyrologies of the eighth and ninth centuries contain valuable references to the martyrs and the cemeteries, especially that known as the *Little Roman* martyrology, and which served as a basis for the well-known compilation of Ado.

Next in importance comes an ancient *Roman Calendar*, published between the years 334-356, written out and illustrated by a certain Furius Dionysius Philocalus, who, doubtless, had no idea that he would one day set wagging the tongues of two hemispheres. This calendar contains a list of the Popes, known formerly as the Bucherian Catalogue, from the name of its first editor, and the Liberian, from the Pope with whom it ends. The whole book is now known as the "Chronographer of A.D. 354." Besides this

<sup>1</sup> One of the last works of De Rossi was to prepare, in co-operation with Duchesne, the text of this most tangled and corrupted document for the latest volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* (1894).

ancient papal catalogue, the book contains an official calendar, civil and astronomical, lunar cycles and a paschal table calculated to 412, a list of the prefects of Rome (254-354) the only continuous one known, a chronicle of Roman history, the *natalitia Caesarum*, and other useful contents, which have caused it to be dubbed the *oldest Christian Almanac*. It contains numerous traces of having been drawn up for the use of the Roman Church, and hence the value of two of its documents for the cemeteries. They are, respectively, a list of the entombments of Roman bishops from Lucius to Sylvester (253-335), with the place of their burial, and a *Depositio Martyrum*, or list of the more solemn fixed feasts of the Roman Church, with indications of several famous martyrs and their cemeteries. The importance of all this for the original topography is too clear to need comment. We will only add that closer examination of the ecclesiastical documents of the chronographer of 354 leaves us persuaded that they date from the third century and represent the location of the cemeteries at that time and the martyrs whose cult was then most popular.

In the latter half of the fourth century Pope St. Damasus (366-384) did much to beautify the ancient Roman cemeteries and to decorate the tombs of the most illustrious martyrs. As he possessed a fine poetic talent, he composed many elegant inscriptions, which were engraved on large marble slabs by his friend and admirer, Furius Dionysius Philocalus, already known to us as the calligrapher of the preceding document. The lettering used by this remarkable man was very ornamental, and as its exact like is not found before or after, it has been styled the hieratic writing of the Catacombs. In time these inscriptions were copied by strangers and inserted in various anthologies and travelers' scrapbooks or portfolios. Many of the original stones perished from various causes, but were piously renewed *in situ* during the sixth century. To these Damasan inscriptions De Rossi owes much, since any fragment of them in a cemetery indicates an historic crypt, and their copies in the manuscripts are links for the construction of the chain of history that connects each great cemetery with the modern investigator.

To the above *fontes*, or sources of information and control, De Rossi added the *historico-liturgical* literature of the Roman Church from the fourth to the eighth centuries—the period in which the bodies of the most celebrated martyrs began to be removed en masse from the catacombs, through fear of the marauding Lombards. Such are the *Liber Pontificalis* in its several recensions, the acts of the martyrs, chiefly the Roman ones, the calendars of the Roman Church constructed out of the missals or sacramentaries, the antiphonaries, capitularies of the Gospels, and

the like, in which not unfrequently there are hints and directions concerning the cemeteries and the martyrs of renown who were yet buried there. Finally, the *Maestro* extracted almost endless information from the old Roman topographies of travellers and the itineraries of pilgrims. Of the former we possess yet two curious remnants, entitled *Notitiæ regionum urbis Romæ* and *Curiosum urbis Romæ*, as well as a list of oils collected at the shrines of the Roman martyrs by an agent of Queen Theodolinda, and known as the Papyrus of Monza. An old Syriac text of the sixth century and a note on the *innumcræ cellulæ martyrum consecratæ* in the almanac of Polemius Silvius (449) complete the list of strictly topographical authorities. Certain itineraries of pilgrims from the seventh to the ninth century are not less useful as indicating the names and sites of the cemeteries, whether above or below ground, and what bodies were yet entombed therein, as well as the distances between the cemeteries, and their position relative to the great monuments of the city.

After the middle of the ninth century the historic crypts had been emptied and the bodies brought to Roman churches. Naturally, the written references to the catacombs ceased with the visitors, and a stray chapter in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romæ* or an odd indication in the *Libri Indulgentiarum* kept alive the memory of those holy places which once attracted a world of pilgrims. It is not easy to explain how one of the best of the old itineraries, referable to the seventh century, should have fallen into the hands of William of Malmsbury, and been by him copied into his account of the visit of the crusaders to Rome under Urban II. Neither is it easy to explain why the old itineraries of Einsiedeln, Würzburg and Salzburg make no mention of the tombs of such celebrated Roman martyrs as St. Clement the consul, Saint Justin the philosopher, Apollonius the Roman senator, Moses a famous priest of the time of Saint Cornelius, and many other celebrities of the early Roman Church, who were, in all likelihood, buried in some of the many Roman cemeteries. What the old pilgrims saw they related honestly and faithfully; more they compiled from guides now lost. They were not learned men, but pious travellers, anxious to benefit their successors, and unconsciously enabling us to form some exact idea of the solemn cultus that they once assisted at.

Such, in general, were the means which De Rossi had at hand for the reconstruction of that under-world of Christian Rome. But what pen will relate his patient research in all these old manuscripts and books? Or who can properly estimate his fine ingenuity of cross-examination, by which he laid bare the genesis of his authorities. Scarcely a library in Europe did he leave un-



visited in his determination to bring together every scrap of evidence as to the name, site and monuments of the Roman cemeteries, and his very wanderings diffused a new enthusiasm in every country, and brought new disciples yearly to the modest home beneath the shadow of the Capitol. It would take too long to enumerate all the results of his excavations in the Roman cemeteries. As far as published, they are to be found in the three great folios of his *Roma Sotterranea*<sup>1</sup> and in the *Bullettino di Archæologia Christiana*. The former includes only the results of work done in St. Callixtus and the little network of crypts and burial places connected with it.<sup>2</sup> His intention was to take up all the cemeteries in turn, and when death surprised him he was far advanced with the publication of his labors in St. Domitilla. When the cemeteries had been excavated and described, it would be time to think of the great synthetic work that Settele and others sighed for, and which he himself looked forward to in his dreams.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *La Roma Sotterranea Cristiana*, descritta ed illustrata dal Cav. G. B. De Rossi, pubblicata per ordine della Santità di N. S. Pio IX. Romæ: vol. i., 1864; vol. ii, 1867; vol. iii., 1877.

<sup>2</sup> The most famous of his discoveries in the cemetery of Callixtus are, besides the identification of it, the crypt of Lucina, the Papal crypt, with epitaphs and *loculi* of third century Popes, the crypt of St. Cecilia, the sepulchre of St. Cornelius, the arena-rium of St. Hippolytus, the epitaphs of St. Eusebius and of Severus, and the cemeteries of St. Soteris and St. Balbina, closely connected with that of Callixtus. I forbear to speak here of the paintings and sculptures or of the *varium suppellectile*, the lamps, medals, glasses, ivories and other sepulchral furniture of the Christians, in all of which St. Callixtus is rich. The prefaces of the *Roma Sotterranea* contain a complete history of the Catacombs, their origin and Christian character, their external vicissitudes, the order and method of their construction, their decoration and use as places of worship and the gradual decline of their fame. The results of the excavations, from an artistic and theological view-point, are well summarized in a number of works, notably in the *Roma Sotterranea* by Northcote and Brownlow, and in the *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, by the same authors.

<sup>3</sup> "It seems to me that the local and industrial labors of all Christian archaeologists will one day complete the materials for a gigantic work, more beautiful and useful than could ever be hoped for in any minor synthesis of Christian antiquities. I have in mind an *Orbis Christianus*, illustrated by the monuments of the first six or seven centuries. Suarez in the seventeenth, and Garampi in the eighteenth, sketched a vast work, which should furnish us the series of the bishops of every church of Christendom. I desire to see a great Christian geography, in which the origin of each church, the first traces of the faith in each city and burgh, the proofs of its development and full flowering in every province and nation of the ancient world shall be collected and disposed in geographical and historical order. That day, the smallest shred of an old epitaph, the least bit of an old sculpture, will be witnesses of the highest importance as proving the presence of Christians in such a place and such a century. The very scarcity or even absence of these indications ought to nerve us to fresh research on the lines of history and topography. I hope the day will come when my *Roma Sotterranea* will be but a part of an *Orbe Cristiano Monumentale*, for which both I and other editors of the sacred monuments are but the purveyors of material or builders of particular parts."—*Roma Sott.*, vol. i., p. 82.

## V.

Though De Rossi did not live to finish his *Roma Sotterranea*, he left abundant materials for that purpose in his *Bullettino di Archæologia Cristiana*, a serial publication, which was like a continuous appendix to the two great works we have hitherto been describing. It consists of five series—from 1863 to 1894—and is ornamented by a multitude of rare plates, maps, engravings, designs and inscriptions, that are found elsewhere with difficulty or not at all. A complete copy of it is now a precious rarity.<sup>1</sup> For a time it was regularly translated into French, first by Martigny and then by Duchesne. It is a workshop or storehouse of materials, in which De Rossi laid up countless essays, notes, disquisitions on the written and unwritten monuments and sources of Christian antiquity. There is scarcely a Roman cemetery unmentioned here. Those of Maximus and Hermes and Hippolytus, of Generosa, Ciriacus, Peter and Marcellinus, the Ostiano, and the cemeteries of Callixtus, Balbina and Agnes have many pages devoted to them, while much of his enormous and entirely novel studies concerning the cemeteries of Domitilla and Priscilla saw the light for the first time in its columns. The overground cemeteries and the suburban ones, as well as the various hypogei and crypts, Jewish and heretical cemeteries, that in the sacred grove of the Fratres Arvales, and even Mithraic grottoes—all find welcome here, where a great fund of observation and suggestion is massed up against future need. Epitaphs and inscriptions that in any way throw light on his cemetery work are copied here with extreme care, and largely commented on, whether Roman or foreign; early Christian or mediæval; classic, Damasan or *graffiti*; opistograph, forged or defaced.

It is interesting to read on one page an essay on the epigraphic traces of Christianity in Pompeii, on another of the inscriptions that enable us to trace back the Christian character of the Pomponii Græcini and the Acilii Glabriones to the first preaching of the faith in Rome, on a third of the invocations scratched by early Christian sailors on a great rock in the port of Sira, and on a fourth of the epitaphs of the African martyrs of Milevi and Sétif. The ancient Christian memories of SS. Peter and Paul, scattered through the old Roman world, were always dear to De Rossi, and he has noted a great number of them from the old bronze medalion of the founders of the Roman Church down to the Chair of St. Peter, on which there is a long and elegant dissertation. Famous sepulchres in the old Roman churches, like those of Junius Bassus and St. Cyril, drew from the *Maestro* a fund of lore on the burial

<sup>1</sup> *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, del Cav. Giovanni Baptista De Rossi. Roma, 1863-1894 (five series).

customs of the early Christians, while the origins of the earliest Roman churches exercised always a special charm on his antiquarian soul. He lingers long and lovingly over the early history of St. Clement and St. Maria in Trastevere, St. Prisca and St. Pudenciana, the basilicas of Domitilla, Petronilla, Nereus and Achilles, Cosmos and Damian, and the massive old fortress-church of the Quattro Coronati. The fourth century was in many ways a remarkable one in Rome. It saw the gradual transfer of the balance of power, both popular and legal, from pagan to Christian hands—an act which left its impress on the public monuments, like the Arch of Constantine, and in the history of the great Roman families. In the *Bulletino* we seem to watch this struggle as though it took place to-day, and there are few specimens of eloquence more simple and monumental than the essays on the cessation of the priesthood of the *Fratres Arvales*, and the Mithraic cult. On the other hand, we are initiated into some secrets of the wealth and prestige of the Roman Church, when we see how the families of the Aurelii, Flori, Uranii, Dasumii, Petronii, Cæcillii and Secundi embraced the Christian doctrines and placed at the disposal of the Pope the wealth inherited from long lines of pagan ancestors.

The theologian finds tidbits for himself in the new and unique vindication of Liberius by means of an epitaph, in the many antiquarian references to the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and to the institution of the consecrated Virgins, in the solid inscriptional proofs of the invocation of the saints, the veneration of the martyrs, whose autographs, trials, life in the mines, and proselytizing zeal are all exhibited to us as in a mirror. The lawyer reads with avidity the notes on associations at Rome, on the law covering burials, on the sepulchral jurisdiction of the pagan Pontiffs, and on the delimitation of public and private domain. There is strong food for the patrologist in the studies on the *Philosophoumena*, and for the historian in the numerous notices of ancient MSS. and the contents of old archives and libraries.

Here you will find, in distracting confusion, accounts of old archæologists and necrologies of later ones, summaries of standard publications on archæological subjects, and descriptions of Christian museums, notably that of the Lateran. The arts and the artists of the Middle Ages, especially those of Rome, their *biblia pauperum* and their elegant mosaics, their tessellated pavements and the slender grace of their campanili, tempted him at times from the strict limits he had set himself; he even wandered into the preserves of the Renaissance occasionally, and always returned with fresh laurels, envied by the masters in those departments.

De Rossi kept a watchful eye on the development of Christian

antiquarian science the world over. Wherever the Christian faith had left its imprint on a people, there must be more or less evidence of its workings. Thus he followed every find and excavation in Africa, Spain, Egypt, Greece, Sicily, Germany, France, Italy and the Orient, ever eager to add to the treasures of Christian remains. In this manner the *Bulletino* has become a great thesaurus for the study of early Christian art, and there is many a ravishing page in it on ancient crosses and medals, on rings and spoons, with Christian *siglæ*; on wine jars and oil bottles marked with the cross; on lamps and ornamental fishes; on Christian jewel boxes and eucharistic plates found as far away as Siberia; on the trinkets of a Christian empress and the collar of a Christian slave; on chalices and medal moulds, combs, bells, fragments of a marble lattice to separate the sexes in church; leaden plaques with exorcisms, and a multitude of odds and ends of a Christian life and culture that have utterly perished, save for these traces. Was ever more delicate homage paid to a religion than this pious retracing of the smallest vestiges of the past?

## VI.

"*La pianta uomo cresce più robusta in Italia che altrove nel mondo*," says Alfieri, and De Rossi is a proof of it. The same man who delved in the bowels of the earth for the annals of the religious past was also one of the scribes of the Vatican library. Indeed, he was the dean of the little body of those Vatican *Scriptores*, who recall the monastico-literary brotherhoods of the Middle Ages, and the notaries, who have ever surrounded the Bishop of Rome from the very earliest days of Christianity. The cataloguing of the Vatican archives is an almost superhuman task; it has been some centuries in execution. The last six of the great folios, which contain the index as far as it is completed, are the work of De Rossi's hand and brain. I say brain, for it is no small task to read over thousands of manuscripts, often in the most wretched disorder, dispose them, describe them in scientific language, assign them to their proper epoch, note the peculiarities which distinguish them and the like.<sup>1</sup> That is a work demanding iron nerves and

<sup>1</sup> *Codicum Latinorum Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ*. Tomus X., opera et studio J. B. De Rossi, scriptoræ linguæ latinæ, adjutore Odoardo Marchetti.

Pars i. (Nos. 7245-8066); Pars. ii. (8067-8471). Tomus xi. (8472-9019), operam conferentibus Paolo Scapaticci scriptore linguæ Syriacæ et Al. Vincenzi scriptore linguæ Hebraicæ. Tomus xii. (9020-9445); Tomus xiii. (9446-9849). *Indices* tomorum xi., xii., xiii., *codicum Latinorum Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ* cura et studio J. B. De Rossi, adjutore Josepho Gatti. Pars I. Index auctorum, etc. Pars II. Index rerum locorum, hominum, etc. This huge manuscript inventory includes the Latin manuscripts added to the archives since the beginning of this century. Copied in splendid calligraphy, it serves the daily needs of the scholars who come to the archives from all parts of the world.

and self control no less than the most varied acquisitions and a critical acumen of the rarest kind. A double series of the Latin and Greek codices has already begun to issue from the Vatican press. Of the former, the Palatine (Heidelberg) manuscripts are the first to be codified in printed form. The two Stevensons, father and son, have charge of the work, and De Rossi has contributed an admirable sketch of the origin, evolution and strange vicissitudes of the Vatican Library and Archives from the dim dawning of the power of the Bishop of Rome down to the time of Innocent III.<sup>1</sup> The rest of the history of the library has been told by Father Ehrle in his history of its transfer to and return from Avignon, and the story of the archives in the last three centuries has been amply reviewed by M. Gachard, a Belgian scholar.

Few things strike the visitor to Rome more forcibly than the great and solemn mosaics of the Byzantine type which are to be seen in the oldest of the Roman churches. The art of mosaics is a peculiarly Christian product, and, as such, could not fail to engage the attention of such an enthusiast for Christian art as De Rossi. He began and carried on almost to completion the publication, in large folio volumes, of magnificent chromo-lithographs of the Roman Church mosaics prior to the fifteenth century. The collection is entitled "*Mosaici delle Chiese di Roma*."<sup>2</sup> Already twenty-three numbers of this unequalled work have been issued. Their price, however, puts them beyond the reach of ordinary purses. There is no keener delight for the student of the past than to turn over these wonderful sheets filled with figures of noble gravity. The enthroned Christ, the adoring elders, apostles and saints, the allegorical lambs, running waters, palms, etc., transport us almost to the gates of paradise. We forget their imperfections for the sublime serenity and recollection of these strange figures that haunt us forever from their station in the apses or on the façades, confessions, arches and porches of Rome's oldest basilicas and churches.

The minor writings of De Rossi cover a very widefield. His literary activity was of the most miscellaneous kind, though its objects were by no means heterogeneous; on the contrary, he always kept well within the lines of classic and Christian antiquarian culture.<sup>3</sup> He was one of the mixed commission which

<sup>1</sup> *De origine, historia, indicibus scripturæ et bibliothecæ Sedis Apostolicæ*. Romæ, 1886. Printed as preface (pp. i.-cxxxii.) to the first volume of the printed Catalogue of Vatican Latin MSS (*Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana: Codices Latini*).

<sup>2</sup> *Mosaici delle Chiese di Roma anteriori al Secolo XV*. Roma Spithöver, 1872-1892. Con testo bilingue, italiano francese: grandi tavole cromolitografiche (fasciculi i-xxiii).

<sup>3</sup> His disciple, Prof. Gatti, has drawn up a chronological series of his minor writings, which is to be found in the *Album* of 1892. A full catalogue of all the known works

brought out the fine edition of the works of Bartolomeo Borghesi, by order of Napoleon III., and his intimate friendship with the great numismatist enabled him to draw from their correspondence much material for the elucidation of the knotty questions concerning the coins and inscriptions treated of in these splendid folios.<sup>1</sup> Valuable contributions from the pen of De Rossi are scattered through dozens of Italian and foreign learned periodicals and newspapers. Gatti counted, in 1892, over three hundred such essays, notes, reviews and the like, from a few pages in length to full book size. How much more of the kind is scattered throughout his voluminous, well-ordered correspondence of over ten thousand numbers! He was inimitable in the art of presenting the rarest information in terse, clear and limpid language, without seeking any other pathos than what naturally arose from the statement of unadorned truths, long denied, but at last vindicated. He seemed to have reached at one stride a certain perfection in these antiquarian essays, as any one may see who will compare his early treatises on *The Christian Inscriptions of Carthage* and *On the Christian Monuments that bear the figure of a Fish*, with his later *saggi* on the cancellation from an inscription of the name of a vestal virgin become a Christian, on the find of Anglo-Saxon coins in the Roman Forum, on the magnificent "Codex Amiatinus," or Bible of Ceolfrid, and on the *capsella argentea Africana*, or silver work-box found at Carthage and presented to Leo XIII. by Cardinal Lavigerie.

He was not merely a writer, an excavator, a hunter of Christian curios and oddments. The organizing talent was strong in him. Insensibly he drew men about him and assigned them tasks, by the fulfilment of which they have grown great in the world of letters. He thoroughly understood the value of modern expositions and congresses, and the need of giving forth to the people the safe conclusions of the scholar. At London and Paris he exhibited plans of the catacombs, and would have done the same at Chicago, if age and infirmities did not prevent him. The late international scientific congresses of Catholics had no better friend than this old archæologist. He understood well their spirit and their trend, and contributed to those of Paris (1888, 1891) the *primeurs*, or advance sheets, of his studies on the Cemetery of Priscilla, long his favorite field of labor, and in which the holy martyrs finally obtained for him some of the sweetest delights that a Christian scholar can hope to experience.<sup>2</sup> It is scarcely

that issued from the pen of De Rossi would fill over twenty-five closely-printed folio pages.

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres Complètes di Bartolomeo Borghesi*. Vols i.-ix. Paris, 1862-1884.

<sup>2</sup> These studies are found in the *Comptes rendus* of the congresses, and in substance in the *Bulletino*.

possible to read with dry eyes the narrative of that long pursuit of fifty years crowned with such final success. In his language, bristling with technical terms, there is an intensity of devotion, an impatient directness of zeal, which betray the Christian investigator, as he tears off the heart of his mystery the last thin shroudings, and *knows* now what hitherto he firmly believed. There are few higher joys—certainly none more exquisite.

The strained relations between the Vatican and the new governors of Italy gave this quiet scholar more than one occasion to do good in a lasting though unostentatious way. Of late years ancient Christian monuments at Rome and elsewhere in Italy have been in great danger of destruction or defacement from the ignorance or ill-will of the actual authorities. The world-wide fame of De Rossi has enabled him to interfere several times, and with success, as in the case of the Church of the Quattro Coronati at Rome, and of Saint Severano, at Naples. It is mainly to his labor and skill that we owe the Christian Museum of the Lateran, one of the most fascinating collections in Europe. The idea, it is true, cropped out frequently during the last century, and various attempts were made to make the Vatican the centre for all such monuments. But under Gregory XVI., and later, under Pius IX., the Lateran palace was set aside for this grand enterprise, which was set in motion by Padre Marchi, and has since been conducted by his more illustrious disciple. In this great multitude of ancient Christian objects, nothing is more striking or more valuable than the long lines of Christian epitaphs and inscriptions, arranged in chronological and logical order, and illustrating, with undeniable veracity, the beliefs of the primitive Roman Christians, their discipline, rites, manners and habits, or life. In 1877 there were known over 15,000 such *monumenta litterata*, whole or broken, and De Rossi then asserted, in a public discourse, that their number grew at the rate of five hundred a year.<sup>1</sup>

De Rossi was never a professor, but one will look in vain for a nearer approach in our day to the old Hellenic teachers or the great scholastics of the Middle Ages, who lived in the tenderest intimacy with their pupils. His real chair was in the depths of the catacombs or in the Lateran galleries, where he practiced his ingenious *μυστηριώδης*, like Socrates on the banks of the Ilissos or in the streets of Athens, and forced the choicest minds to disengage for themselves the true spiritual realities that lay wrapped up with the fragments of epitaphs and the smoke-stained frescoes of those mysterious cities of the dead. He was always surrounded by a

<sup>1</sup> *Il Museo Epigrafico Cristiano Pio-Lateranense.* Roma, 1877.

little cosmopolitan circle of men, drawn to Rome by the fame of the great scholar. He met them off-hand in the streets, at home, on his walks, in the catacombs, at the Lateran, or St. Peter's. If teaching be the development of the human faculties through the effusion of acquired information, and the best method and incitement be the simple exhibition of the professor's own ways of gaining knowledge, then De Rossi was one of the greatest teachers of any age, and the grass grown ruins of Christian Rome were his Portico. He fastened to himself with hoops of steel men of the extremest religious and national tendencies. Mommsen and Duchesne, Henzen and Bruzza, the English Stevensons and American Frothinghams, Danes, Russians, Austrians, Orientals, came in turn to experience welcome and instruction from this patriarch of Roman antiquities. He was a type of the true broadness and the solidly liberal sentiments of the Roman Catholic Church, which seeks on all sides the eternal truth and holds fast to it in all earnestness and charity. For years he conducted the public meetings of the Society for Christian Archæology<sup>1</sup> and the Venerators of the Holy Martyrs, and during the Roman season he might be heard once a month expounding in the catacombs, or within some ruinous old basilica of historic martyrs, before a motley crowd of sight-seers and pilgrims, the plans, the curiosities, or the history of this weird subterranean world.

## VII.

"*De sculptore, pictore, fusore, judicare nisi artifex non potest.*" says the younger Pliny. Only one who approached De Rossi in phenomenal acquisitions could fitly judge of him as a *savant*. The preceding pages are some witness to the extent of his antiquarian knowledge, but no mere tale of his writings can convey a just idea of that mind, in which all the treasures of antique and mediæval culture were stored up with order and distinction. He had read every ancient author of the Greek and Latin world, whether pagan or Christian, and properly allocated what each conveyed toward his main object—the illustration of the origins

---

<sup>1</sup> The valuable proceedings of this body of disciples and admirers of De Rossi have been for some years published in the *Bulletino*, and form one of its chief attractions. The monthly meetings of the society usually draw many learned strangers and exercise a salutary influence on the study of Christian antiquities. The *Collegium Cultorum Sanctorum Martyrum* has its seat near the Vatican at the German Campo Santo, where is situate a community of scholars who dwell on the very site that Charlemagne acquired as a burial place for his Franks who died at Rome. Among the writer's most pleasant souvenirs are the gentle courtesies and kindly helps which he once received from these gentlemen, several of whom are among the best Christian antiquarians of to-day. It would be odious to distinguish, but the names of Monsignor de Waal, Wilpert, and Kirsch deserve a special mention.



of the Christian Church in the period of Greco-Roman civilization. Before him others had gone over the same field, but none with the same method and the same good fortune in the discovery of the precious wreckage of original monuments. The sum of the written remains of antiquity has been considerably increased in this century by happy finds or skillful restoration. Much light has been thrown on them—on the one hand by judicious criticism and tireless research, on the other by marvellous discoveries in the Orient—discoveries which do not redound solely to the credit of classic or pagan archæology, but are of priceless worth for early Christian life, literature and belief. De Rossi was contemporary with most of this progress, and it would not be too bold to say that he was intimately acquainted with every item of it that in any way interested the history of the city of Rome, the catacombs, the ancient Christian literature and the growth of Christian art.

As an investigator in new provinces of learning he was distinguished by his scientific probity and modesty. He was strictly honest in his method and in its application, never trying to gloss over weak points and never claiming for his arguments a cogency they did not possess. Nor did he attempt to read into his authorities conclusions that they did not justify. On the other hand, he was fearless and frank in maintaining what he recognized as the truth, and did not let himself be frowned down by pompous or malicious ignorance. His style was plain and direct, devoid of ornament—a very model of historic narrative. The fullness of his learning, the aptness of his illustration, the ingenuity of his parallel and comment, lent a strange eloquence to expositions otherwise dry and solemn as a column of figures. The Latin of De Rossi is grave, elegant, translucent, racy. It breathes strong with repressed feeling; it moves like the discourse of a judge, convinced where lies the truth, but anxious to deal fairly with both sides; it is the speech of one bred to the law, but whose mind dwells with delight upon the masterpieces of the golden latinity. It is the easy, correct, elegantly familiar Latin of the fine Italian scholar, equally removed from the stilted, involved speech of his Teuton colleagues and the straight discourse and irreverent brevity of certain English Latinists. Some of the prefaces to his great works will live long in the memories of all who love the large and flowing language of Latium, its superb majesty, its inimitable grace, richness and precision, its religious gravity, and its memorable annals of conquest temporal and spiritual. De Rossi was not without his trials, and his labors were at times misrepresented; but he found a firm protector in the papacy, as is illustrated by more than one little anecdote that circulates among his friends and admirers. Angry, uncharitable controversy pained his heart, saturated with the sweet religious peace

of the holy places in which he spent so many days and nights among the martyr dead who await the resurrection call. In this respect he was, indeed, *sine felle palumbus*. Though a man of firm Catholic faith, he was supremely amiable and courteous in his dealings with the many who did not share his belief, and among his sincerest mourners are men of the most extreme rationalistic training and views. He was a man of principle, faithful and devoted, known to the inner circle of cosmopolitan Rome as

"The kindest friend,  
The best condition'd and unwearied spirit  
In doing courtesies, and one in whom  
The ancient Roman honor more appears  
Than any that draws breath in Italy."

Livy says somewhere that in studying antiquity the soul becomes antique almost without an effort. And De Rossi had so long studied the growth and vicissitudes of papal Rome that his soul became drenched with loyalty to that race of mighty rulers who carried, and yet carry on within its walls the government of a world many times greater than had ever ambitioned the proudest Cæsar. The path of earthly honor was open to him, had he chosen to abandon the Vatican,

"U'siede il successor del maggior Piero."

But no temptation could corrupt his fine sense of honor, and he remained until death faithful to the successor of Peter and Fabian and Damasus, and Vigilius. His Roman lineage was a matter of just pride to him, and he sat for years in the Roman municipality as the protector of the old local interests of the city and the one scholar tribune whose veto even the fiercest of the new iconoclasts felt bound to respect. As long as men care for the history of the Eternal City; as long as her basilicas, her cemeteries, her museums and her varied literature interest them, so long will they recall the gentle and erudite spirit whose magic touch shed a white light upon all the old monuments of Rome, and whose scientific fiat caused the rubbish of ages to disappear, and gave over to the pilgrims of a new time and culture the roads and pathways closed for over a thousand years. Like some great mediæval architects, he finished none of the colossal enterprises that he began; but his methods, example and principles are perenduring, and have revolutionized archæological studies for many a year to come, while a generation of his youngest disciples will pass away before the *Collectanea* of the master are exhausted.

*Memoria bene redditæ vitæ sempiterna.* There is a pure, serene altruism in certain lives whose laborious course has been kept in

steady orientation to truth and beauty and goodness. Nor do we need to hear a George Eliot preach,

"The choir invisible  
Of those immortal dead who live again  
In lives made better by their presence,  
And make undying music in the world,  
Breathing us beauteous order that controls  
With growing sway the growing life of man."

Between the true doctrines of Catholicism and the natural aspirations and convictions of the human heart there is just such a minute, accurate, and catholic congruism as we should expect from the Divine Founder of that religion. Beneficent lives, however short, never melt into the general void, but shed forever a sweet aroma within the circle of their rememberers. This is the basis of the Communion of Saints, and it is broad enough to justify not only the interest of the Blessed Ones in our lives and their ever-present influences, but also the unbroken operation in human affairs of all choice spirits who have ever uplifted humanity or straightened out its tortuous pathway. So Dante saw on the greensward, outside the air that trembled over the fatal abyss, the pagan just, whose writings and great deeds yet have power to sway the souls of men:

*"In luogo aperto, luminoso, ed alto,  
Sì che veder si potean tutti quanti,  
Colà diretto, sopra il verde smalto  
Mi fur mostrati gli spiriti magni,  
Che di vederli in me stesso m'esalto."*

Homer and Socrates, and Plato and Aristotle, the martyrs and the doctors, and the great pilot-bishops in the Wandering of the Nations; the liberty- and justice-loving Popes and priests of the Middle Ages; the builders of Cologne and the Sainte Chapelle, and the founders of the Italian republics; Dante, and Columbus, and Joan of Arc; Milton and Shakespeare—all these live on forever in the hearts of men, in a sort of earthly apotheosis—household divinities that shield our spiritual hearths from a hundred devastating philosophies and corrupting examples, and preach, in season and out, the lessons of patience, unselfishness, mutual helpfulness, enduring enthusiasm and high idealism—in other words, that pure natural religion, which is the basis of Christianity, and which has been so long saturated with the light of the latter, that in its upper strata it is scarcely distinguishable from the revelation of Jesus. To this elect assembly belongs henceforth John Baptist De Rossi—an example, an inspiration, an index, a complete and rounded specimen of the union of learning and religion. Surely his many

merits won for him a speedy entrance into the heaven he worked for, and we may well believe that the last clouds of ignorance were quickly removed from his noble mind, and that

“The great Intelligences fair  
That range above our mortal state,  
In circle round the blessed gate,  
Received and gave him welcome there,

“And led him through the blissful climes,  
And show'd him in the fountain fresh  
All knowledge that the sons of flesh  
Shall gather in the cycled times.”

T. J. SHAHAN.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON.

---

## THE CENTENARY OF MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

**I**N the last week of the month of June, 1895, the national college of Maynooth will celebrate the centenary of its foundation. For a hundred years of divine favor and protection the bishops, clergy and laity of Ireland, united as they have ever been in the holy bonds of faith, will offer to God the homage of their gratitude and invoke at the same time His all-powerful aid for another century of struggle in His service. In the religious functions in the new college chapel, in a series of academic and literary exercises in the “Aula Maxima,” in the reunions of the former students of the college, in the proceedings of a select and international Catholic congress, in the concerts, addresses and all the other festivities of the celebration, the dominant note will be one of thanksgiving to God for His infinite mercy and goodness. In the course of a single century He has wrought a complete change in the condition of the Catholics of Ireland. During three terrible centuries He allowed their faith to be tested in the furnace of persecution, and by His grace they came triumphant through the ordeal. And now He has rescued them from the land of bondage. He has stretched forth His hand in power. The horse and the rider He hath overthrown. The chariots of Pharaoh He has cast into the sea, and the depths have covered them, and they are sunk to the bottom like a stone. The house of Aaron has hoped in the Lord and He has proved Himself their helper and protector. It is but

natural that they should praise and glorify Him in return, and prove, at the end of a hundred years, that their gratitude is of a profound and enduring nature. It is also usual, on such an occasion, to take a general survey of the history of the institution whose centennial festival is being celebrated. This will be done in the case of Maynooth, during the coming year, in a suitable and lasting form, by the most competent man for the work—the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert, and author of “Ireland’s Ancient Schools and Scholars,” who, at the request of the bishops of Ireland, has undertaken to write the history of his “Alma Mater.” Meanwhile, a brief review of the foundation, history and work of the college may serve to awaken interest in the event, particularly amongst those who sympathize, in America or elsewhere, with the cause it promotes.

Throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century the penal laws were enforced with the utmost rigor all over Ireland. The Catholic clergy were exclusively educated abroad. They came regularly from their churches and colleges on the Continent to encounter slavery or death in their native land. In order to minister to the spiritual wants of their afflicted countrymen they were obliged to assume all sorts of disguises, from the uniform of the soldier and the robe of the physician to the frieze of the peasant and the rags of the mendicant. In the midst of barren moors, in the dark recesses of woods, hidden in caverns or wandering from house to house through wild mountain glens, they pursued their sacred mission. In spite of every device for their destruction they succeeded in baffling their enemies and in maintaining schools for the instruction of Catholic children. Their success was so manifest that in the early part of the century the statute of William III. was frequently enforced against them. This gentle enactment decreed that “if any person whatsoever of the Popish religion should publickly teach school or instruct youth in learning he should be fined £20 and imprisoned without bail or mainprize.” And further to prevent the possibility of Irish Catholics getting any sort of instruction whatever, it was enacted “that if any one should go or send another into France, Spain or Italy to be educated, instructed or brought up, or should transmit money for the support of Irish students abroad, he should be disabled to sue in law or equity; to be a guardian, executor or administrator; to take legacy or deed of gift; to bear office of any kind, and should forfeit lands and goods for life.”<sup>1</sup> Later in the century, during the reign of Queen Anne, an old Act of Elizabeth was renewed, according to which “all Catholic priests and teachers should be banished the

---

<sup>1</sup> 7 Gul. iii., c. iv.

land, and if they returned they should be hanged, disembowelled and quartered."<sup>1</sup> New and increased rewards were offered to all who should hand over a priest or teacher to the civil authorities. Spies and *priest-hunters* were the most favored officials in the country, and they sometimes even put dogs on the trail of their victims. The proselytizing "charter schools"<sup>2</sup> were erected and endowed to induce people to send them their children. In 1727 a law was passed that "no papist should be entitled to vote at any election, either for members to serve in Parliament or for any magistrates or officials of a city or town-corporate." The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered up in hiding-places where there was least probability of interruption, whilst boys were posted as *videttes* to give the alarm in case the enemy appeared. During the vice-royalty of Lord Chesterfield an old house in Dublin fell on a crowd of hidden worshippers, killing them in the crash. All Europe was shocked at the catastrophe.

Such a state of things having prevailed till the century was far advanced, what can account for the sudden and extraordinary change that resulted in the foundation of Maynooth College, in 1795, by the Irish Protestant parliament, and its endowment at the figure of £8000 a year, for the education of the Catholic clergy? The causes, as may be expected, were manifold and varied. The proclamation of American independence, in 1776, taught English statesmen that the liberties of a people cannot be trampled on with impunity, and that sooner or later a Nemesis overtakes and punishes tyranny.<sup>3</sup> The terrible revolution in France brought home to their doors the evils that might be expected from the rage of an infuriated populace. The shrewdest of English observers and publicists, Arthur Young, had warned them of their folly and pointed to its dangers.<sup>4</sup> Their foremost statesmen, Pitt and Castlereagh, were planning the union, and had sinister designs in wishing to placate the Catholics. Nobody contributed a nobler part to the change than Edmund Burke, whose lofty and disinterested views were pressed upon the public in season and out of season. Amongst the leaders of the volunteer movement of 1782 Grattan and Charlemont were well-known sympathizers with the Catholics, and pressed their claims on their Protestant colleagues in parliament. The society of the "United Irishmen" was not less sympathetic. Theobald Wolfe Tone wrote in his private journal, on the 15th of August, 1792: "This country will never

<sup>1</sup> 8 Ann., c. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Warburton, Whitelock and Walsh, *History of Dublin*, vol. ii., p. 336.

<sup>3</sup> See *L'Irlande Sociale, Politique et Religieuse*. By Gustave De Beaumont. Part I, p. 154.

<sup>4</sup> *Tour in Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 50, 51.

be well until the Catholics are educated at home and their clergy elective."<sup>1</sup> In the same year a general meeting of the society was held in Dublin, with the Hon. Simon Butler in the chair, and a report was submitted to the members by their committee, reviewing the disabilities under which Catholics labored in "education, guardianship, marriage, self-defence, exercise of religion, enjoyment and disposition of property, acquisition of property, and the rights of franchise," and the committee wound up with the following solemn declaration, which was unanimously endorsed:

"Your committee submit to you this view of the Catholic Penal Statutes under the galling yoke of which your country has so long and so patiently languished—statutes unexampled for their inhumanity, their unwarrantableness and their impolicy. The legislature, which is instituted to cherish and protect the people, has here overspread the land with laws, as with so many traps, to ensnare the subject in the performance of the obvious and necessary duties of life. We recognize a free state in the right exercised by its inhabitants, of framing laws for the security of their liberty and property against all invasion; but with us the order of civil association is reversed, and the law becomes the foe, the ruffian that violates the rights and destroys the harmony of society. That this infamous system of political torture was not warranted by any alleged delinquency on the part of our Catholic brethren is notorious; for it was devised in times of profound tranquillity. We cannot, then, refrain from acknowledging with sympathy that signal forbearance in our oppressed countrymen which, joined with a laudable sense of shame in the persons insidiously authorized to give efficacy to their acts, has preserved our country from the calamitous consequences of such flagitious misgovernment."<sup>2</sup>

The bishops, likewise, were eager to have an establishment for the education of their clergy at home. Many of their foreign schools had been broken up and their students disbanded. Some had been handed over to dangerous teachers, as a reward for questionable service rendered to revolutionary chiefs. At the great outbreak in 1789 it is computed that there were between six and seven hundred Irish students at different schools on the continent. Of these, 32 were at Salamanca, 30 at Alcala, 30 at Lisbon, 40 at Douai, 30 at Antwerp, 8 at Lille, 40 at Louvain, 30, 12 and 12 in three colleges in Rome; 70 at Prague, 10 at Toulouse, 40 at Bordeaux, 80 at Nantes, and 100 and 80 at two colleges in Paris. Smaller contingents were to be found at Sedan, Charleville, Rouen,

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Wolfe Tone*, August 15, 1792.

<sup>2</sup> *The Report of a Committee Appointed by the Society of "United Irishmen," of Dublin, to Enquire and Report the Popery Laws in Force in this Realm.* Dublin, 1792.

Bilboa, Madrid, Seville, Compostella and Capronica. The old Irish establishments at Evora, Tournay and Poitiers had already been dissolved. And now that disturbance prevailed all over Europe, the situation threatened to become more difficult than ever.

It is no wonder that such a variety of causes and motives should have brought about a totally new departure in 1795. In the early part of that year Earl Fitzwilliam was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but on account of his advanced sympathies with the Catholics and the Irish people generally, he was recalled by the Duke of Portland in coalition with Pitt, and his place taken by Lord Camden. The new government was strongly opposed to the complete emancipation of the Catholics, but favored the establishment of a college for the education of their clergy at government expense. Accordingly a bill was introduced in the Irish parliament on the 24th of April, for the purpose of making provision "for the better education of persons professing the popish or Roman Catholic religion." The bill was presented by Mr. Secretary Orde and seconded by Henry Grattan. It passed both houses without any difficulty, and on the 5th of June received the royal assent. The general provisions of the bill are outlined in the preamble, as follows: <sup>1</sup>

"Whereas by the laws now in force in this kingdom, it is not lawful to endow any college or seminary for the education exclusively of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and it is now expedient that a seminary should be established for that purpose; be it therefore enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and commons in the present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the Rt. Hon. Viscount Fitzgibbon, Lord Chancellor of Ireland; the Rt. Hon. John, Earl of Clonmell, Chief Justice of King's Bench; the Rt. Hon. Hugh Carleton, Chief Justice of Common Pleas; the Rt. Hon. Barry Yelverton, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, and the chancellor or lord keeper, chief justices and chief baron of the said courts for the time being, together with Arthur James Plunkett, commonly called Earl of Fingall; Jenico Preston, commonly called Viscount Gormanstown; Sir Thomas Browne, Baronet, commonly called Viscount Kenmare; Sir Edward Bellew, Baronet; Richard Strange, of the City of Dublin, Esq.; Sir Thomas French, Baronet; Reverend Richard O'Reilly, of Drogheda, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend John Thomas Troy, of the City of Dublin, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Thomas Bray, of Thurles, Doctor in Divinity; Rev. Boëtius Egan, of Tuam, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Philip McDavett, of Strabane, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Patrick

---

<sup>1</sup> *Statutes of the Irish Parliament*, vol. xvii., pp. 511, 513.



Joseph Plunkett, of Navan, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Francis Moylan, of Cork, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Gerald Tehan, of Killarney, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Daniel Delaney, of Tullow, Doctor in Divinity; Reverend Edmund French, of Athlone, Doctor in Divinity, and the Reverend Thomas Hussey, of the City of Dublin, Doctor in Divinity, and the persons to be hereafter elected, as by this act is directed, shall be trustees for the purpose of establishing, endowing and maintaining one academy, for the education only of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion; and that the said trustees shall have full power and authority to receive subscriptions and donations to enable them to establish and endow an academy for the education of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the annual value of one thousand pounds, and to erect and maintain all such buildings as may be by the said trustees deemed necessary for the lodging and accommodation of the president, masters, fellows, professors and students who shall from time to time be admitted into or reside in such academy."

The details of the enactment are then proceeded with, and the sum of £8000 is allocated for the work.

On the 28th of July the trustees met in the chambers of the lord chancellor in the old parliament house in College Green, and discussed the question of the site for the new college. Several proposals were submitted, but it was finally decided to accept the offer of the Duke of Leinster, who was anxious that the college should be established on his own estate, and who was prepared to grant fifty-four acres of land at a reasonable fee and at an annual rent of seventy-four pounds. Twenty additional acres immediately contiguous were subsequently obtained and added to the grounds.

The first president of the new institution was the Rev. Thomas Hussey, a native of Waterford and in every respect one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of his time. Dr. Hussey was educated at the University of Salamanca, and at the end of his course entered the Abbey of La Trappe, with the intention of consecrating himself entirely to religious life. Pressure was brought to bear upon him, however, both by his old masters at Salamanca and by the authorities in Rome, to leave the cloister and follow a mode of life more suited to his talents and in which he could render signal service to the Church. Dr. Hussey obeyed, and at an early age was appointed chaplain to the Spanish embassy in London. Here he became a great preacher and a prominent figure in learned societies and in all associations for the promotion of Catholic interests.<sup>1</sup> He was the bosom friend of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Johnson*. 8vo. Vol. iii., p. 557.

old Dr. Samuel Johnson, in connection with whom Boswell speaks of him as "a man eminent not only for his powerful eloquence as a preacher, but for his various abilities and acquirements."<sup>1</sup> In the year 1792 he was admitted a "Fellow of the Royal Society of London." A short time before, he had been requested to go on a mission to the Holy See by the Committee of English Catholics, of which Lords Stourton and Petre, Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Throckmorton and Sir H. Englefield were the most prominent members. He enjoyed the closest friendship and confidence of two successive Spanish ambassadors, Prince Mazinano and the Marquis del Campo. Whilst enjoying their hospitality he frequently met Lord Chatham, the Duke of Portland, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. But he was particularly indebted to his position here for his first acquaintance with the illustrious Edmund Burke, who became, from that forward, his closest friend and most powerful ally in all his efforts for the relief of his fellow-Catholics. King George III. used also to appear at the embassy from time to time, and on one such occasion he had a long conversation with Dr. Hussey, who made on him so favorable an impression that he afterwards employed him on important business of state in several messages to the Spanish government, in conjunction with a certain Mr. Cumberland. This gentleman became quite jealous of the attentions that were paid in Madrid to his distinguished companion, and describes him, in a fit of vindictive jealousy, in his memoirs, as a man who had left no earthly passion behind him in the cloister, but, nevertheless, "a man of talents, nerve, ambition, intrepidity—fitted for the boldest enterprises." Charles Butler, in his "Memoirs of the English Catholics,"<sup>2</sup> tells us that on another occasion Dr. Hussey accompanied Sir John Webb on a visit to Vienna. "During their stay a negotiation was on foot between the emperor and the porte, and the wise Joseph, in his usual manner of affecting great business, was forever saying, 'J'attends un courier de Constantinople.' This was so frequently repeated that it became a kind of *soubriquet* among the courtiers. At this time the treaty for peace between England and America was first opened. It happened that, on receiving some propositions from America, the House of Commons adjourned for a fortnight. 'Mais donc,' said the emperor to Dr. Hussey, 'expliquez moi cela.' You are panting and dying for a peace. At length she advances towards you, and instead of running up to her and embracing her, you adjourn for a fortnight. 'Expliquez moi donc cela.' 'Mais

<sup>1</sup> *Life of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary.* By Rev. Thomas R. England. P. 230. London, 1822.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of the English Catholics.* By Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn. Vol. iv., pp. 438, 441.

cela est clair,' said Dr. Hussey, 'c'est que nous attendons un courrier de Constantinople.' The expression got into the mouth of every one, and for three days Dr. Hussey was the first man in Vienna."

Notwithstanding his worldly associations, Dr. Hussey was ever a profoundly religious man—the same, in fact, who wished in his early years to be buried forever in the monastery of La Trappe. His zeal in the Catholic cause knew no limits, and his zeal was surpassed only by his success and the wonderful charm of his personal influence over the statesmen and people of the world with whom he was brought into contact. He was, accordingly, designated, by the nature of things, as the fittest man to carry out the new project of the government at Maynooth. He was left, however, only for a few years at the head of the infant establishment, when he was promoted to the bishopric of Waterford. His reign in the episcopal ranks was of very short duration, but was signalized by his presence at the conferences held in Paris for the drawing up of the concordat between the first Napoleon and Pope Pius VII., at which he acted in conjunction with Cardinal Gonsalvi and the Archbishop of Corinth, receiving for his diplomatic delicacy and tact the thanks of the emperor as well as those of the Pope. His health was shattered by the annoyance he got on account of his first pastoral letter, which was a splendid, manly exposition of Catholic doctrine, rights and duties, and a bold denunciation of the oppression to which Catholics, and particularly the Catholic soldiery in his diocese, were subjected. Whilst his former friends in government now turned upon him and attempted to crush him, he did not receive from his colleagues in the episcopate the support which he expected. Burke alone remained faithful to him to the last. "From the moment that the government who employed you betrayed you," he wrote, in 1797, "they determined at the same time to destroy you. They are not a people to stop short in their course. You have come to an open issue with them. On your part, what you have done has been perfectly agreeable to your position as a man of honor and spirit."<sup>1</sup> Such language from the most honored statesman and distinguished writer in Europe was no small consolation for the loss of other friends.

Such was Dr. Hussey, the first president of Maynooth College. "His name," wrote Charles Butler, "will long live in the memory of his friends—a man of great genius, of enlightened piety, with manners at once imposing and elegant, and of enchanting conversation. He did not come into contact with many whom he did not subdue; the highest rank often sank before him."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Plowden's *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, vol. ii., part ii., p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 439.

The first vice-president of the college was the Rev. Francis Power, who had been educated in Paris and had become canon and archdeacon of the Cathedral of Avignon. The Rev. Maurice Aherne was appointed professor of dogmatic theology. He was a native of Kerry, studied at Paris, where he obtained his degree and acted for a while as professor of theology in the university. The Rev. Thomas Clancy was nominated to the chair of Holy Scripture. He was a graduate of the University of Prague, where he had been also a professor for some time. The chair of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy was given to the Rev. Peter Delort, who had emigrated to England, during the revolution. He was a native of Bordeaux. The Rev. Andrew Darré was appointed professor of logic. He was a native of Montau in Gascony, and had been professor in a college at Toulouse. To the chairs of Rhetoric, Humanity, and English, the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, James B. Clinch, Esq., and the Rev. Charles Lovelock were named. Of these, the one who became best known in the literary world was, undoubtedly, the Rev. John C. Eustace, author of the "Classical Tour in Italy," the following memoir of whom appeared in the "Gentleman's Magazine," of October, 1815:

"Recently died at Naples, of a fever, the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, the accomplished author of the 'Classical Tour in Italy.'" Few works of equal magnitude and on a subject unconnected with the feelings or occurrences of the day, ushered into the world by no patronage and written by a man till then known to a small circle only of friends, ever experienced so rapid a diffusion or acquired to the author so sudden and extended a reputation. His acquaintance was sought by almost all persons in this country distinguished by rank and talents, and their expectations of pleasure and profit from his society were more than equalled by the amenity of his manners. Dignified without pride, cheerful without levity, in his intercourse with the world, he never for a moment lost sight of his sacred character or its duties, which he fulfilled without ostentatious display or affected concealment. Although his 'Tour in Italy' exhibits not only his extensive acquaintance with Catholic and polite literature, but his cultivated and refined taste, yet the spirit of Christian morality and benevolence which breathes in every page, is, perhaps its most striking feature. In that 'Tour,' which was performed in 1802, he was accompanied by the present Lord Brownlow, Robert Rushbrooke, Esq., and Philip Roche, Esq. In June, 1814, he accompanied Lord Carrington in an excursion to Paris; and a short time after, appeared his Letter from Paris, in which he gave a very interesting description of the French capital, its public buildings and works of art. In 1814 he published 'The Proofs of Christianity,'

which are compressed within a small compass and explained in plain easy language, in the interrogatory form. The chief arguments in proof of Christianity are here arranged and examined under twelve heads: prophecy, miracles, the preaching and styles of the Apostles and Evangelists, the sublimity of the Christian doctrine, the purity of Christian morality, its efficacy in the reformation of mankind, the testimony of martyrs, the conversion of the world, the perpetual duration of the Church, the immutability of the Christian doctrine, the accomplishment of the predictions of the Gospel, the fate of the Jews. In this valuable tract, technical expressions and controversial allusions are avoided; and it is well calculated, as the pious author intended, to promote the general cause of Christianity."

With its small but distinguished staff of professors, Maynooth College was soon in working order. It began with something like fifty students; and it was with difficulty even that this small number could be accommodated. The old house originally taken, could barely provide room for twenty students in addition to the professors. The remainder had to lodge in the little town and attend their classes in the college. But soon new buildings were erected. Parliament made the grant of £8000 an annual concession. The sum was increased by the united British Parliament in 1808 to £9500. A legacy of £500 a year was obtained in 1803 from Lord Dunboyne, who had been Bishop of Cork, and who had apostatized and got married, but repented on his deathbed and devised all his property to the new institution. A lawsuit ensued in which Lord Dunboyne's relations pleaded undue influence and claimed that the will was null and void on account of the property laws against Catholics. John Philpott Curran acted as the advocate of the Bishops, with the result that a compromise was arrived at and the suit compounded. More ample and just provision was made for the material wants of the college in the year 1845 by the government of Sir Robert Peel. The yearly endowment was raised from £9500 to £26,000; and an additional £30,000 was granted to provide buildings suited to the high purpose for which the college was instituted. When the Prime Minister submitted his bill to Parliament a fierce storm of bigotry was raised all over the kingdom. It shrieked itself hoarse, but had practically no other effect. Once ministers had made up their minds they could not be shaken and they were liberally and loyally supported. The debates on the several readings of this bill are amongst the most remarkable in the history of the British Parliament.<sup>1</sup> The measure was fiercely contested. Representatives of the old school

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, May, June, and July, 1845, *passim*.

of oratory and of the new took part in the struggle. Sir Robert Peel, Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, Monckton Milnes, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Macaulay, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, Mr. Shiel, Sir C. Napier, Lord Edward Bruce, Lord C. Wellesley and Mr. Wyre, championed the cause of Maynooth and the increased grant, whilst its opponents counted amongst their number Mr. Disraeli, J. C. Colquhoun, Sir H. Douglas, Lord Hillsborough, Mr. Newdegate, and Sir C. L. Inglis. Notwithstanding the opposition from within and from without, the bill passed the House of Commons by over a hundred of a majority. Its fate in the House of Lords was equally successful. Championed by the most respected and popular of the members of the aristocracy, it received serious opposition only from the Bishops of the Established Church and a small knot of high and dry Tories and bigots. The Duke of Wellington, now in his seventy-sixth year, gave it his hearty support. The Duke of Leinster, the Marquis of Normanby, the Marquis of Landsdowne, the Earl of Rosse, Lord Brougham and Lord Campbell made eloquent speeches in its favor, whilst the opposition was left to such minor lights of debate as Lord Clancarty, the Earl of Winchelsea, and the Protestant Bishops of Cashel, Landaff and London. Its triumph secured for Maynooth the most prosperous spell of its existence, between 1845 and 1869. In the latter year the Protestant Church was disestablished in Ireland by the government of Mr. Gladstone, and, notwithstanding the ridiculous inequality and want of parallel between the two cases, the annual grant was also withdrawn from Maynooth College.<sup>1</sup> A capitalized sum, amounting to fourteen years' purchase, was, however, handed over to the trustees. It amounted to £364,600, and this sum, carefully invested and guarded by the bishops, has been the material mainstay of the college ever since. Though very inadequate to supply the wants of the college it has been supplemented from time to time by charitable members of the clergy and laity, who naturally felt that their money could be applied to no more noble and far-reaching purpose than the education of a priest.

It must not be supposed that these important changes in the fortunes of Maynooth College were allowed to pass unnoticed by the enemies of Catholicism. A regular tide of bigotry and hatred poured its abuse in torrents on the establishment. Indeed, the anti-Maynooth literature of the century would fill a good-sized library. These works provoke now only a smile of mingled astonishment and satisfaction. It is hard to believe that at a period so recent such diatribes could have been indulged in, and it is something to be thankful for that the man who would attempt to

---

<sup>1</sup> Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, May and June, 1869, *passim*.

renew such methods of controversy at the present day would be excluded from all decent society in these countries. We might well afford to pass over in pity the ravings of these scribblers, were we not tempted to cull from them a few gems for the amusement of our readers. One of the earliest of the band was a Protestant barrister, named O'Driscoll—an apostate, we suspect; for apostates are generally got to do shady work. This individual published a book, in 1823, entitled “Views of Ireland, Moral, Political and Religious,” in which we come across the following specimen :<sup>1</sup>

“The system of education adopted at Maynooth is such as to impregnate the minds of the students with sentiments of the bitterest hatred to Protestants and the most intense detestation of England. Imbued with the sanguinary spirit of intolerance and artful equivocation, it is scarcely to be wondered at that they have constantly joined in all sorts of political movements and in every species of popular agitation; that their character is one for turbulence, for sedition and immorality; that they carry out to the letter, in their practical life, the doctrines contained in the notes of the Rhemish Testament, which declare it essential for a Roman Catholic to believe that it is lawful to murder Protestants and break faith with heretics. Primed to the full with bigotry, intolerance and hatred of England, the Maynooth priest forms, in the parish in which he is located, a nucleus of outrage upon Protestants, disaffection towards England and bitter animosity and discord. His breast, a dark concentration of sectarian fury, dogmatical self-deification and superstitious zeal, inoculates the whole neighborhood with the deadly virus, and the public mind of Ireland is thus manacled in the grinding fetters of spiritual vassalage.”

In 1836 the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel published his “Notes of a Tour in Ireland.” During this precious tour he was hospitably received and entertained in Maynooth College, which he expressed a desire to see. The courtesy and hospitality of the president and professors were repaid by such choice language as the following :

“I could not but reflect on the prodigious moral power lodged within the walls of that rough-cast range of buildings. What a vomiting of fiery zeal for worthless ceremonies and fatal errors. Thence how the priestly deluge, issuing like an infant sea—or, rather, like a fiery flood from its roaring crater—pours over the parishes of Ireland, to repress all spiritual improvement by their anti-Protestant enmities.”

In the year 1841 a Barrister of the Inner Temple, in London, named James Lord—a man who seems to have had little to do at

---

<sup>1</sup> *Views of Ireland, Moral, Political and Religious.* 1823. Vol. ii., p. 3.

his profession—published a volume on Maynooth, its grant and its teaching.<sup>1</sup> The volume is so full of the cant in vogue in these days that it is not worth wasting space upon. Suffice it to say that all the delicate compliments paid to the “Romish priesthood” by his predecessors in the beautiful art are repeated and commended. But the greatest storm raged in the ranks of this ill-assorted army during the passage of the bill of Sir Robert Peel, in 1845. It was then that the volume entitled “Maynooth Tried and Convicted” appeared. Another warlike production was entitled “The Continuation or Increase of any Grant for the Education of the Romish Priesthood a National Sin.” Basketfuls of pamphlets on the wickedness of the morality taught “in the Romish Seminary of Maynooth” were distributed gratis all over the country. In these, Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, Menochius, Maldonatus and Dens were held up to the execration of mankind by ridiculous and, for the most part, ignorant and anonymous nobodies. Finally, a great conference of the opponents of Maynooth was held at Exeter Hall, in London, where all the rampant orators from England, Ireland and Scotland congregated to denounce the government and its project. Here Wesleyans and Baptists took their stand beside the ministers of the established church. Tresham Gregg went over from Dublin; Scotland sent delegates from its “free kirk”; the University of Cambridge supplied the organizers. For several days the whole crowd revelled in Exeter Hall, denouncing popery, intolerance (!) and Maynooth.<sup>2</sup> They were allowed to let off steam in peace. The most representative and respected members of their own sects kept aloof from the proceedings, which had the good effect of concentrating the attention of the world on the narrow-minded bigotry of the delegates themselves and provoking a corresponding amount of ridicule and contempt. One of the last of the class of adverse critics of Maynooth College was a certain Sir Francis Head, who visited the college about the year 1852, and in an octavo volume entitled “A Fortnight in Ireland,” published soon after, devotes considerable attention to the college, its professors, students and work. It would scarcely be fair, however, to class him with the undiscerning crowd with whom we have hitherto dealt. His criticisms are relieved by some generous passages and are distinguished by an almost complete absence of the rabid and unscrupulous misrepresentations that distinguished the earlier works. They were such,

<sup>1</sup> *Maynooth College; or the Law Affecting the Grant to Maynooth, with the Nature of the Instruction there Given.* By James Lord, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

<sup>2</sup> See *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845.* By Rev. A. S. Thellwall, of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1845.



nevertheless, as to draw from the well-known Dr. Murray a scathing and well-merited castigation.<sup>1</sup>

Whilst all the storms were blowing outside, the work of sanctification and of moral and intellectual progress was peacefully carried on in the halls and oratories of the college. In the first half of the century two of its professors stood out in special prominence. They are Louis Ægidius Delahogue and John MacHale. Dr. Delahogue was a French refugee, who had been a doctor of the Sorbonne and had taught theology for some time in the University of Paris. From 1832 to 1835 he published in Dublin several important theological treatises which, in these days, were of the greatest possible benefit to his students. They were chiefly "De Mysterio Trinitatis," "De Incarnatione Verbi," "De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ," "De Sacramentis in Genere," "De Eucharistia," "De Religione." Dr. Delahogue has sometimes been accused of Gallican tendencies in his teaching in Maynooth. That, however, is a controversy which we could not open here and have no desire to open anywhere.

Dr. MacHale, who afterwards became Archbishop of Tuam, *clarum et venerabile nomen* published in 1828, his "Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church," in two volumes. It is a masterly work and presents a splendid vindication of Catholic doctrine against the Protestant errors most prevalent at the time. From the year 1826 to 1864 the scientific department of the college was represented by a man of original and inventive genius and of great piety, Dr. Nicholas Callan. His chief triumphs in the scientific departments were 1st, the invention of a species of galvanic battery of great power, in which lead was substituted for the platina of Grove's and the carbon of Bunsen's batteries, and in which the voltaic current, excited by a mixture of concentrated nitric and sulphuric acid, far surpassed in power anything that had hitherto been produced; 2d, the invention of an "induction coil of great power," which held its ground for eight years as the best of its kind in Europe, and which the author fully described in an article in the "Philosophical Magazine," of June, 1863. A description of the battery was also read for Dr. Callan before the "Royal Irish Academy" by Sir Robert Kane, on the 10th of May, 1847.

In later times, and to speak only of those who have gone to their reward, two other names stand prominently forward as having long been connected with Maynooth. They are those of Dr. Charles William Russell, uncle of Lord Russell, of Killowen,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Essays, Chiefly Theological.* By Rev. Patrick Murray, D.D. Dublin, 1852. Vol. iv., pp. 27, 31.

the present Chief Justice of England, and Dr. Patrick Murray, whose name we have already mentioned. As an accomplished scholar Dr. Russell had a European reputation. As a refined and courteous gentleman he was well-known in England and Ireland; but his holy life, his genial character, his playful wit, his wonderful power of endurance at work, his personal influence in every-day life—these were things that were known only to his colleagues and to the students with whom he lived and in the private circles that claimed him as an intimate friend. In his "Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti," all his powers of scholarship are brought into play. An intimate friend of Cardinal Wiseman, he became a constant contributor to the *Dublin Review* for a great number of years. When the State papers of the reign of James I. were to be published, the British "Master of the Rolls" fixed upon Dr. Russell as the most capable and conscientious man in the United Kingdom to perform the task. Of his long and affectionate intercourse with Cardinal Newman we need say nothing. The cardinal himself has put on record his indebtedness to him by dedicating to him his "Loss and Gain," and by the passage in his "Apologie," in which he says:

"The last letter which I have inserted is addressed to my dear friend, Dr. Russell, the present President of Maynooth. He had, perhaps, more to do with my conversion than any one else. He called upon me, in passing through Oxford in the summer of 1841, and I think I took him over some of the buildings of the University. He called again another summer on his way from Dublin to London. I do not recollect that he said a word on the subject of religion on either occasion. He sent me at different times several letters; he was always gentle, mild, unobtrusive, uncontroversial. He let me alone."<sup>1</sup> During the period that Dr. Russell occupied the position of President of Maynooth, he displayed great energy and taste in promoting the material welfare of the college. It was mainly owing to his exertions that the foundation of our present college chapel was laid in 1875 and that the building was carried so rapidly to completion.

Dr. Murray was a very different man from Dr. Russell; not different in piety or goodness, for he, too, was a man of the most saintly character; but different in his general method of viewing things and dealing with them. Dr. Russell was bashful and kept clear of controversy as far as he conscientiously could; but Dr. Murray had the ardor of a real combatant and seemed to revel in the fray. His splendid treatise, "De Ecclesia," in which he deals with the most specious arguments of Protestant writers, won him a place amongst the first theologians in the Church in his day.

<sup>1</sup> "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," by J. H. Newman, D.D. 8vo. ed., p. 317.

But his fame does not rest on that work alone. His treatise, "*De Gratia*," is found still a useful handbook, and his "*Essays Chiefly Theological*" prove him to have been not only a man of deep learning, but also of wide and varied culture. He had made a special study of English literature and had a splendid command of the English tongue. This free acquaintance with the best models in literature give a certain charm to his works and make them pleasant to read even at considerable interval of time. This, we venture to predict, is more than is ever likely to be said of the great mass of biblical, theological, and general ecclesiastical literature of a later period, which, in form and outline, seems every day to display less and less of the native inward symmetry, light and beauty of the subject.

Dr. Murray was always a courteous and fair-minded opponent, but whenever he suspected a want of good faith or saw an index of groundless and inveterate prejudice against the Church on the part of his opponents, he struck out with little ceremony and drew upon a rich and well-stored arsenal of invective, ridicule and scorn, which silenced and confounded his enemies. Thus a certain Dublin lawyer, named James Whiteside, who afterwards became Chief Justice of Ireland, visited Italy in the year 1847 or 1848 and published a work on his travels, in three volumes, in which he revives every scandal and calumny that the malice of centuries had trumped up against the Papacy, from the sufferings of Beatrice Cenci, immortalized by the painter, Guido Reni and the poet Shelley, to the intrigues of Massimo D'Azeglio, and the administration of Pope Pius IX.

Dr. Murray does not think it worth while to deal very seriously with an author of this kind, who spreads himself over three volumes with inflated self-satisfaction and lays down with dogmatic intolerance a series of facts and deductions which genuine and impartial history had long since proved to be mere fiction and nonsense. The Maynooth professor can, therefore, not be blamed if he writes as follows, on the appearance of a fresh volume of Whiteside's "*Italics*."

"The readers of Carlyle's works are familiar with a class of persons, whom in his own rather quaint, but not less picturesque, manners, he designates "*Windbags*." Now the writer of the book before us is a genuine specimen of the windbag class. This Mr. Whiteside published, some time ago, a work on Italy in three volumes, characterized in no small degree by three qualities often enough combined together in the same subject—ignorance, impudence and excessive prejudice. . . . Mr. Whiteside may be a very effective orator in Green Street or in the Four Courts, but we can assure our readers that his essays on Italian affairs indicate a very

small degree of mental vigor and what, for an orator, would seem even more strange, a very small degree of literary culture. He raves like a maniac against the Pope, whom, with genuine impertinence and arrogance of a certain class of Dublin Protestants, he scornfully designates "the priest." He stamps, screams, foams, chokes, in the fervor of his anti-papal madness. He is exceedingly angry with the French for saving Rome from the domination of some thousands of robbers and assassins. Thus he discourseth"—etc.

If Dr. Murray had not been a theologian, if he had not consecrated all his energy and thought to the defense of Catholic truth and to the engrossing work of teaching, if he were less conscientious in all that concerns the sacred character of a priest, there is little doubt that he could easily have acquired a place amongst the very foremost of the literary men of his time. As it was, the call of his heart was for higher things and a more solid fame. It was only during his holidays that he allowed his vivid imagination the free indulgence which it seemed to claim, and then in delightful exuberance it pictured in colors of brilliant harmony the fairest features of the land he loved.

Cloudless sky and sparkling sea,  
Cliff and shore and forest tree,  
Glen and stream and mountain blue  
Burst at once upon the view ;  
The gay, the beautiful, the grand  
Blending over wave and land  
Till the eye can ask no more  
Than it hath in sweet Glandore.

There was one other influence that swayed him all through life, viz., his intense devotion to the Holy See. It appears in all his works—in his "Church Tract," in his "Essays," in his "Reviews," but prose could not contain it. He wanted to communicate it; to make it popular, to enshrine it in some work of art, where it could not be forgotten or hidden away. This he did in his little "Song for the Pope," which is still sung and will long be honored at all social reunions of the Irish clergy. In the third stanza of this lyric effusion the old man gave concentrated expression to the two dominant passions of his heart—his love of country and his love of Rome.

"O'er all the orb no land more true  
Than our own old Catholic land,  
Through ages of blood to the Rock hath stood ;  
True may she ever stand !  
Oh, ne'er may the star St. Patrick set  
On her radiant brow decay !  
Hurrah for the grand old Catholic land !  
For the grand old Pope hurrah !"

We should like to give here a sketch, however short, of many other Maynooth men—of Dr. Kennehan, the great Celtic scholar and the author of a valuable work on the “History of Music,” who was president of the college for many years; of Dr. Montague, one of the ablest administrators who ever ruled the college; of Dr. Joseph Dixon, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, author of a valuable “Introduction to Holy Scripture,” and many others, but we feel that we have run our course and have got fair latitude. There is one feature, however, of the work of the college on which we have laid but little stress, and which we must naturally regard as the main purpose of its existence. We mean the teaching and spiritual training of the students. In that matter we must only allow results to speak. Maynooth, which began a hundred years ago, with fifty students, has now six hundred and twenty students resident in the college. During the greater part of the century it has had over four hundred. The course of studies extends over seven years and in some cases over nine. The great numbers that have passed through this course are chiefly in Ireland, but many of them are scattered over foreign lands, all engaged in the same good work. In Ireland, one of them is a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, two are archbishops, eighteen are bishops. In America they count amongst their number the Archbishops of St. Louis and Chicago; in Australia, the Archbishop of Melbourne; in South Africa, the Bishop of Cape Town, etc. The number of dignitaries and hard-working missionary priests in other grades of the hierarchy cannot easily be reckoned. Thus, Maynooth has not only given the greater number of its priests to the Irish Church during the past century, but like the great institutions of the olden times—Iona, Bangor, Lismore, Clonard—has sent faithful and zealous messengers of the Gospel to every part of the world.

J. F. HOGAN.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH.

---

THE GRANDEUR OF ANCIENT ROME—A PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.

THE history of Rome is almost the only ancient history worth knowing. The great monarchies that preceded Rome—Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Persia and Macedon—disappeared like falling stars; their language and remains may instruct the philologist and the antiquarian, as *aërolites* and meteoric stones interest the scientist; but only the spirit and influence of Rome still continue to inform the world. We rank the Greeks with that class of men whom Napoleon contemptuously called *Idéologues*. The Romans, on the contrary, were, above all things, men of action. We have read of Greeklings, but who has discovered a diminutive for Romans? Etymology even points a finger in the right direction, for the more important terms of religion, and words that convey a nobler idea of conduct and of duty, come to us from the Latin and not from the Greek language. Thus we have Divinity, Trinity, Incarnation, Absolution, Consecration, Communion, Ordination, Ceremony and Pontiff; thus, also, we study the *classics*, we live under *civil* government and *republican* institutions, we love *urbanity*, we respect a *statesman*, we admire a *victorious* general. In the history of Greece there was an Ionic Confederacy and an Achæan League, but the Greeks never seemed able to get beyond the idea of a city and rise to empire. They could form States but never a Nation, and there was always something narrow and parochial about the public policy of Athens, Thebes and Sparta. The Romans, on the contrary, felt their spirit constantly swell within them to extend the boundaries and the power of Rome. A faint-hearted sentimentalist has said that a people is happy that has no history, but so did Sancho Panza say "Blessing on him who invented sleep." Americans will scorn the "dreamful ease" of lotus-eaters, and call that people happy which has a stirring, struggling, active and energetic history, a progressive people preparing better things for generations yet unborn.

The poets, historians and philosophers of Rome have lauded, almost beyond measure, their own power and glory; but the Holy Ghost is a witness in their favor in the first Book of Maccabees, viii., 1-16. We must read Roman history with the assured conviction that God made the Romans so great only as a preparation for the empire of Christianity. St. Paul, it is true, tells us that they were "without mercy." They were selfish and cruel, and carried out to the letter in their dealings with other people the

spirit of that old predatory family of the Scottish Borders, "Thou shalt want ere I want."<sup>1</sup> Still, their courage and devotion were sublime, and in reading of the violent deaths of so many of their heroes, we feel a sort of contempt for the spiritless end of Alexander the Great, of whom the Scriptures tell us, "and after all these things, he fell down upon his bed and knew that he should die." When Vespasian saw his end approach, he rose from his couch, although tortured with pain, saying that an emperor should meet death standing: "Imperatorem, ait, stantem mori oportere."

The evolution of original Rome was extraordinary. The Rome of Romulus—Roma Quadrata—originally confined to the Palatine was to cover the Seven Hills; and

"Her speedy growth alarmed the States around,  
Jealous; yet soon, by wondrous virtue won,  
They sink into her bosom."

Roma means *strength*, and Rome was a name that struck fear into all who heard it; but the anagram is amor—*love*. Rome conquered but to save. It is also singular that a word in such common use as *palace* carries the mind back to the days when Evander, the shepherd-king, dwelt on the Palatine, which Festus<sup>2</sup> tells us was so called because flocks of sheep pastured and bleated thereon: *Quod palare, id est errare, ibi pecudes solerent*. Now, the legitimate successor of this king and priest and shepherd of his people is the Bishop of Rome, our Holy Father the Pope, under whom and with whom—*urbis et orbis*—there is "but one fold and one shepherd."<sup>3</sup>

Roman conquests are justified politically and philosophically, because they added to civilization new dominions, and developed in the conquered races a capacity for progress in the higher conditions of life. The world owes to Rome that noble idea of Law as opposed to the debasing conception of Will, and from this all modern advances of society have been developed. When a Roman general had completed the conquest of a country, its government was transferred to a civil officer called prætor, who was a magistrate charged with administering justice. Hence the term *Jus Prætorium* given to the body of his decisions. His authority was unlimited; but unless he ruled with equity, he would be called to an account and punished when he returned to Rome. He did not usually dare to exercise the whims, the humors, the caprice and the tyranny of an individual mind. He represented in his office the collective wisdom of the citizens of Rome, and was responsible in his person for the prudence, justice and moderation

<sup>1</sup> Motto of the Cranstouns, one of whom was Governor of Rhode Island in 1724.

<sup>2</sup> *De Signif. Verb.*

<sup>3</sup> John, x., 16.

with which he had administered his trust. All his edicts and public acts were prefaced by those famous initials, S. P. Q. R., which signified that the Senate and People of Rome were a terror to evil-doers but a guarantee of redress to the innocent. The highest reward the prætor could expect when his term was ended would be to have a medal struck in his honor with his name and the words *provincia pacata* engraved thereon, to show that he had pacified the province, reorganized its government, and brought its administration within the sphere of the public faith and peace of Rome: *Fides publica* ; *Pax romana*. It was no exaggeration of Pliny to speak of the immeasurable grandeur of the peace of Rome: *Immensa romanæ pacis magnitudine*. No wonder the poet Rutilius Numatianus, although of the race of the conquered and romanized Gauls, addressing Rome personified after bathing the Forum with his tears as he takes leave of the Eternal City, cries :

*" Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam ;  
Profuit invitis, te dominante, capi ;  
Dumque offers victis patrii consortia juris,  
Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat."*

Of many men one country thou dost make ;  
Thou savest all, if all to thee shalt take ;  
And whilst dost share the benefit of Law  
One city makest of what was a world before.

Roman civilization differed from older civilizations in some essential points. The Greeks called all older people Barbarians, and the eastern monarchies always kept their conquered subjects in the relation almost of slaves to their masters. The Romans, on the contrary, assimilated conquered races, admitting them gradually to all the rights of Roman citizenship. This was remarked and lauded by Saint Augustine in earlier, and by Sir Francis Bacon in later times. The former says in his " Treatise on the City of God." " All who belonged to the Roman Empire were, by a most kind and generous policy, admitted to citizenship and placed on an equality with the citizens of Rome itself ; so that what was formerly the privilege of a few now became the rights of all." The latter in his essay (XXIXth) on the " True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates," writes : " All states that are liberal of naturalization towards strangers, are fit for Empire. . . . Never any state was in this point, so open to receive strangers into their body, as were the Romans. Therefore it sorted with them

<sup>1</sup> Lib. v., Cap. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> In the original ; *Gratissime atque humanissime factum est, ut omnes ad Romanum imperium pertinentes societatem acciperent civitatis et Romani cives essent ; ac si esset omnium, quod erat ante paucorum.*



accordingly; for they grew to the greatest monarchy." If we substitute republic for monarchy, we might justly attribute these words to ourselves; for nothing has so much increased the population, wealth and formidableness of the United States as the good use made by Congress of its power "To establish an uniform rule of naturalization;"<sup>1</sup> and it is also curious, for the sake of analogy, to note that among the grievances against King George III., enumerated in our Declaration of Independence is this one: "He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners (and) refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither."

Another distinguishing characteristic of Roman civilization was respect for law. Other people had law even while living under despots; but law like that of the Medes and Persians<sup>2</sup> hampers with changed conditions, rather than assists development. Law, in Rome, kept pace with the growth of the city until it expanded, at last, into that great body—*Corpus Juris*—which Bossuet called the grandest product of the human mind and which is the groundwork of legislation for modern Europe and America. The original constitution of the Roman Republic was contained in the Twelve Tables which the school boys for four hundred years had it as an invariable task to commit to memory. It is a simple code founded on nature and reason. Cicero inculcates, as does every Roman jurist before him, that law is a necessary condition of liberty. We are the servants of law, that we may be free: *Servi legum, ut liberi esse possimus*; and no more fitting commentary can be found on the *De Officiis*, the *De Legibus*, and the *De Republica* than these inspired words, "An obedient man shall speak of victory."<sup>3</sup> In the Roman Republic as in the American, the civil law was supreme. No general could assume command of troops until the *Imperium* had been conferred upon him by the Senate acting on a *Lex curiata*, or, as we would now say, until he had received his commission. The civilian character of the Romans was so well recognized that Virgil even after the passing of the republic and the rise of absolutism, sings of the "Romans masters of all, the men who wear the Toga," which was the distinctive garment of the citizen as opposed to the *Paludamentum* or soldier's cloak. He has seemed to want to insist on the fact that Rome rose to so great a domination less by the power of the sword than by the influence of her laws.

The Roman youth was taught that man's first duty was to the immortal Gods, the next to his country, then to his parents, and

<sup>1</sup> Constitution, Article I., Section 8.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel vi.

<sup>3</sup> Prov. xxi, 28.

thus on to other people; *ut prima officia diis immortalibus, secunda patræ, tertia parentibus, deinceps gradatim reliquis debeantur.*<sup>1</sup>

When people live under law they will prosper and acquire property and build up institutions of beneficence and learning. The Romans had a profound respect for the rights of property, and it is wonderful how much of the Institutes, the Codex and the Digests treat of real and personal property. These rights guaranteed to the citizen by law were a great advance upon other civilizations where everything, in theory at least, belonged to the ruler. One of the laws of the Twelve Tables consists of only four words, but they teach the sacredness of property, the importance of vested interests and the value of citizenship; *adversus hostem æterna auctoritas*; "against a stranger the right of possession is eternal,"—i.e., a stranger, a foreigner, an enemy cannot, even by prescription, ever obtain legal sanction in the property of a Roman.

The superiority of ancient Rome to all previous civilizations is also manifest in its engineering and architectural skill, which covered the world with works of public utility. Others raised hanging gardens, temples, obelisks and endless colonnades; but they made roads, bridges, sewers, built aqueducts and erected amphitheatres. It is worth remarking, as an illustration of the practical genius of the Romans, that the two oldest and best preserved of all their monuments are the *Cloaca Maxima* and the *Mamertinum*, a sewer and a prison, which testify to the existence of law and of sanitary regulations. In Asia Minor, where the Turks have been dominant for five hundred years, almost the only roads and bridges still in use were constructed by the Romans two thousand years ago. This shows the difference between a Roman and a Mohammedan conquest.

The greatness of a people can always be measured by the position of woman among them. In nothing so much as in this does the superiority of Roman to every other civilization stand out. Professor Mahaffy, in his "Social Life in Greece," p. 147, says of the Greeks of the Attic age, that he finds it hard "to explain the really Asiatic jealousy with which women of the higher classes were locked up in imperial Athens and the contempt with which they were systematically treated," and Macaulay is not ashamed to avow it part of an excellent education, in his essay on the Athenian orators, to finish the day in the company of a courtesan: "and away to sup with Aspasia." Nothing like this could be said of the Romans. The status of woman was recognized by law. She had her rights as well as her duties. The impure customs of Eastern nations, the cruel observances of Phœnician cities, the unnatural unions of the Egyptians, the obscene

<sup>1</sup> *Cic. de officiis*, i., 55.

shrines of the Greeks excited among the Romans only horror and disgust. They could not have made a hero of Sardanapalus or have erected temples to a Cyprian or a Corinthian Venus.

They built temples to female chastity—*Pudicitia*—and to the happiness of woman—*Fortuna Muliebris*. Among other people, woman was a slave or a toy of man, but among the Romans she was his wife and his companion. Who can read the short but touching chapter of the "Annals" (iii., 76), in which Tacitus describes the funeral of Junia, niece of Cato, sister of Brutus, wife of Cassius, dying under the despotism of Tiberius, sixty-four years after the battle of Philippi, without recognizing the fact that even in pagan Rome woman had a sphere of usefulness and action beginning in the family and continued in public life? The honor and inviolability of vows of chastity among the Romans is evidenced by the institution of the Vestal Virgins. The Holy Scripture,<sup>1</sup> Herodotus and other ancient writers prove that it was among the devilish deceptions of Gentilism to induce females to sacrifice their chastity on the altars of their Gods. So great an infamy never existed among the Romans, who exalted the female sex in the honor they rendered to virginity, and the divine beatitude of the clean of heart rested upon these vestals in later times when so many of them became Christians, and we hear Prudentius in his hymn to Saint Lawrence say,

*Edemque Laurenti tuam Vestalis intrat Claudia.*

Lovers of the classics will remember the exquisite tribute to holy purity which the pagan poet, Catullus, pays in the *Carmen Nuptiale* (lxii.), where the virgins beginning sing, *Ut flos in septis secretus nascitur hortis*, than which there is nothing more beautiful in any language, except the lines in Milton's *Comus* on "Saintly Chastity." Too little attention, as we have frequently observed, is paid by visitors to the *Museo Chiaramonti* in the Vatican to what is yet a singular monument which illustrates passages from Pliny<sup>2</sup> and Valerius Maximus,<sup>3</sup> and makes us believe that it might well be that a merciful God who chose a Virgin for his mother when he became Man to redeem the world would work a miracle even among pagans for the sake of so great a virtue as "the sun-clad power of Chastity." This is an ancient, beautiful and life-size marble statue of Tuccia with a sieve in her hands and in the act of walking. She was a vestal virgin wrongfully accused of having violated her vow. It was in the year 609 A.U.C.,<sup>4</sup> and the maiden, protesting her innocence, proposed to

<sup>1</sup> Baruch., vi., 42-43.

<sup>2</sup> *H. Nat.*, xxviii., 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Factorum Dictorumque Memorabilium*, viii., i., 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Ab Urbe Condita*: From the foundation of the city, from which the Romans computed time.

prove it by carrying a sieve full of water from the Tiber to the Temple of Vesta, near the Forum, which she did. The death of Lucretia, too, on which Saint Augustine is so severe,<sup>1</sup> yet bears testimony to the high ideal that the Romans had of conjugal chastity and how they execrated and avenged the abominations of the younger Tarquin :

"Since Rome herself in them doth stand disgraced,"

as Brutus exclaims in Shakespeare's noble poem. The Romans gave binding force to the original divine ordinance of monogamy or the life-long union of one man and one woman. A recent writer, Mr. Charles Letourneau, says in his otherwise reprehensible work on the "Evolution of Marriage and of the Family," "Roman customs conceded to woman a certain liberty of manners which the Greeks would not have tolerated. The Roman woman walked in the streets, went to the theatre with the men, shared in banquets, etc., yet she was, especially in primitive Rome, subjected first to her father, then to her husband, and, besides, public opinion obliged the woman to use in great moderation the practical liberty that was left to her. The famous epitaph of the Roman matron, *domum mansit, lanam fecit*, is well known. This epitaph may perhaps exaggerate, but it does not lie. Suetonius tells us that the daughters and grand-daughters of Augustus were compelled to weave and spin and that the emperor usually wore no other garments but those made by the hands of his wife and sisters" (p. 199). One of the beautiful stories of ancient Rome, which the artist Camuccini had made popular, is that of the ostentatious Lady of Capua who after spreading on the table her rings and bracelets, her precious stones and starry gems, asks to see Cornelia's jewels, and is told, as her two boys come in from school, that *these* are her jewels. It was an answer worthy of the mother of the Gracchi, who refused the hand of King Ptolemy, esteeming it more honorable to remain the widow of a Roman citizen than to become the wife of a sovereign prince. It was, indeed, a great thing to bear the proud title of Roman Matron.

Another special distinction of the Romans was their patriotism. Their native country was endeared to them as *Patria*, the Fatherland. Thus the national poet sang of Brutus who put aside the affection of a parent to remember only his duty to the state :

*Vincet amor patrie laudumque immensa cupido.*

This love of country bred among them a practical common sense which saved them from the fate of Greeks and Orientals, for "tide whatever betide" to them personally, there was always something

<sup>1</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, i., 19.

above them, something greater than they and dearer to them than life—the Commonwealth—*Respublica*. This sentiment produced a wonderful courage and a species of exultant certitude in the final triumph of the Eternal City, no matter what the present emergency and no matter how imminent and great the present danger. Witness the answer sent to the victorious king of Epirus offering terms of peace, "Rome will not negotiate with an enemy on her soil." Witness the senate and people of Rome going out to meet Terentius Varro after the tremendous slaughter of Cannæ and thanking him because he had not despaired of the republic: *Quod de republica non desperasset*, says Livy.<sup>1</sup> A defeated Carthaginian general would have been nailed to a cross like the dead lions of Numidia which the Mercenaries always crucified. Livy has also preserved<sup>2</sup> an account of the haughty but courageous conduct of Popilius Laenas sent as ambassador to Antiochus, king of Syria, then marching on Egypt an allied state of Rome. Antiochus, on meeting the Roman, offered him his hand, which was indignantly refused, and Popilius gave him the letter of the senate ordering an immediate cessation of hostilities. Antiochus read the letter and promised to reply after consulting his captains. Then Popilius drew with his ivory staff a circle in the sand around the king, and commanded him not to stir out of it until he had given a decided answer. This audacity so disconcerted Antiochus that he at once yielded: *Faciam, inquit, quod censet Senatus*. There is nothing like this in all history, except, perhaps, the composure of Warren Hastings, Governor-General of Bengal, alone in the heart of India and blockaded by the insurgents of Benares, spurning the apology and liberal offers of the Rajah. The history of ancient Rome becomes still more fascinating when it throws a search light, as it were, upon the history of our own times. It is now over thirty years ago that the news of the first great battle for the Union and of our ignominious defeat was talked of at Rome. "All is over," they said; but a young American student of divinity told them not to be so sure of that, for with an enemy before Washington, Congress had just voted five hundred thousand men and five hundred million dollars to prosecute the war. The company laughed in derision; all but a certain old cardinal who said, "The Federals are like the Romans after Cannæ; they do not despair of the Republic; they will win." And we won.

The supernatural is raised upon the natural foundation. Good seed grows up when it falls on good ground. Now, the Romans were originally a monogamous, law-abiding and religious people. They were monotheistic and acquainted with the primitive tradi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Bk. xxii.

<sup>2</sup> Bk. lxx.

tions of the human race, and, to some extent, with the lives, hopes and expectations of the Hebrew patriarchs. The Jewish people had, we know, a providential mission. It was set up like a beacon fire in the midst of idolatrous nations to give light to all the world. The great monarchies of ancient times were brought successively into contact and relation with this singular people. There is a noteworthy passage in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple (circa 1005 B. C.) which illustrates this point.<sup>1</sup> There is reason to believe that among the strangers from far off lands who visited Jerusalem and prayed in the temple, and received instruction from the Levites, was Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome. We have the testimony of St. Paul and some early Fathers to the primitive monotheism and purer religion of the Romans. It is not pretended that the Apostle's words in Rom. i., 18-25 apply exclusively to Rome, but, writing to the Christians of the Imperial City, we may suppose that he had her history and her circumstances more especially in view. We are not, indeed, told by the Apostle how Rome obtained this knowledge, which was afterwards so generally cast aside for grosser things, but others have striven to elucidate the matter.<sup>2</sup>

Tertullian, who had a perfect knowledge of Roman history and jurisprudence, says, in his apology for the Christians, addressed to the Emperor Septimius Severus, and which was composed at Rome between the years 197 and 202: "Observe that whatever is good in your own laws has been taken from the Divine Code, which is more ancient, as I have proved when speaking of Moses."<sup>3</sup>

Juvenal, the great satirist of the first century, writing contemptuously of converts to Judaism, who were then numerous, mentions this mysterious Code.<sup>4</sup> Clement of Alexandria wrote in the third century: "Numa, king of the Romans, was a Pythagorean, and, assisted by the doctrines derived from Moses, he prohibited the Romans from making an image of God in the likeness of either a man or a beast. The Romans, for the first hundred and seventy years, during which they built temples, did not make a single sculptured or painted image; for Numa had instructed them, after the manner of an esoteric (or secret) doctrine, in the truth that it is impossible to attain to the worship of the Most High except through the mind (spirit)."<sup>5</sup> The testimony of Clement is confirmed by that of the pagan writers Plutarch and Varro. The

<sup>1</sup> 111. Kings, viii., 41-43.

<sup>2</sup> *Monotheism—the Primitive Religion of Rome*, by Rev Henry Formby, London, 1877; *Des Causes de la Grandeur de Rome Païenne*, Par un Prélat Romain, Paris, 1880; *Documents Historiques sur la religion des Romains et sur la connaissance qu'ils ont pu avoir des Traditions bibliques par leur rapport avec les Juifs*, A. Bonetty, 4 vols., of which the first was published in 1867.

<sup>3</sup> Ap. xlv.

<sup>4</sup> Sat. xiv., 100-102.

<sup>5</sup> Strom. i, xv.

ancient Romans recognized very jealously the holiness of altars and temples. They were in strong contrast to the flippant Greeks, and Denis of Halicarnassus says, in the second book of the *Antiquities*, "I much prefer the theology of the Romans, considering how very few of the religious traditions of the Greeks are of a kind to lead to any good." The Romans never warred against the religion of their enemies, but tried to conciliate and to win over their gods. Hence, in besieging cities, the Roman priests performed a special act called *Evocatio Deorum*.<sup>1</sup> To the Romans the violation of sacred things was less an offence against the state than an insult to the Divinity. In contrast with this, we may recall the awful retribution which was inflicted one hundred and fifty years after the event, by Alexander the Great, on the sacerdotal community of the Branchidæ, which his army came upon, near the site of the later city of Samarcand, while marching to India. It was, indeed, a dramatic situation, this sudden and unexpected meeting of Greeks in Central Asia. The ancestors of their community had been guardians and treasurers of a temple of Apollo on the Ionian coast, and had surrendered everything to Xerxes as he was advancing into Europe. In the eyes of the Macedonian troops they were guilty of an odious *treason against their native country*, and for this, and not for any violation of duty to their God, their descendants were exterminated. The Romans had the highest respect for the sanctity of an oath. Saint Augustine commends them greatly for it.<sup>2</sup> Hence the constant opposition between the *Fides Publica* of the Romans and the *Fides Punica* of the Carthaginians. We have a great example of the good faith of the Romans in Regulus returning voluntarily to Africa and to certain death:

*"Interque moerentes amicos  
Egregius properaret exul."*—HORACE.

"And forth the noble exile strode  
Whilst friends in anguish lined the road."

The history of pagan Rome is but a preparation for that of Christian Rome. The two Romes must be studied together and in their relation to one another, that we "may declare the virtues of Him who hath called us from darkness to His admirable light." (I. Pet., ii., 9.) Livy and Tacitus should be followed by St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great; Virgil by Dante. Rome and

<sup>1</sup> Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*, Ch. xv. Boissier, *La Religion Romaine*, Paris, 1878, 2 vols., and *Fin du Paganisme*, Paris, 1894, 2 vols., are exhaustive works on the subject of the Religion of the Romans, but only from the time of Augustus.

<sup>2</sup> *De civ. Dei*, i., 24.

the Campagna must be visited with Horace in one pocket and the Acts of the Apostles in the other.

A republican form of government is the only one worthy of a free, enlightened and prosperous people. It was during the Republic that Rome attained the summit of her glory. The Empire precipitated her decline and fall. Then the courtiers and chief officers of state, or of the palace, were freedmen and libertines—ignoble wretches who addressed their master as *Divus*, and spoke of the divinity of the empire. Then was admitted that maxim of aulic jurisprudence—the most shameful, the most infamous and the most degrading to mankind: the Will of the Prince has force of Law; *Quod placuit principi id legis vigorem habet*. There then was an end to the reign of Legality and Order, and *Pax Romana* was but a vain expression. Pagan Rome with all her grandeur only shows how inadequate is human nature without Christianity to realize, to their full extent, the True, the Good and the Beautiful. Pagan Rome could not possibly satisfy, any more than modern and more refined paganism can satisfy, the yearnings of the human mind for some certain knowledge as to the unseen world beyond us, and the cry of the human heart for an Object to be loved by and to love with a love “strong as death,” in this life of the world around us and within us.

The Stoics, noblest and last of the Romans, became pessimists, and ended by raising suicide to a fine art. Hopeless pride and the desolation of despair characterize the end of the republic and the course of empire. To the Christian there is nothing more horrifying in the Latin classics than that splendid but terrible blasphemy which Lucan puts in the mouth of Cato who kills himself that he may not see the face of Cæsar:

“*Victrix causa Deis placuit—Sed victa Catoni.*”—*Phars* i., 168.

‘Cato loves the lost cause; nor cares what the Gods have favored.’

Then again that British chief whom Tacitus describes driven by the Roman legions to the end of the earth, and standing on a cliff above the waters of the ocean, who turns before he takes the fatal leap to utter this reproach:

“*Ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*”—*Agric.*, xxx.

‘They make a desert and they call it peace.’

Yes, Rome said: Be mine and I will give you peace and ye shall share with me “all the kingdoms of the world, and their glory.” Men answered, But thy peace leaves us still unsatisfied. Thy peace indeed! “A thing wherein we feel there is some hidden want.”



Then from a distant country, little, poor, and despised, was heard the voice of Him who said: "Come to me all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Take up My yoke upon you, and learn of Me because I am meek and humble of heart; and you shall find rest to your souls."<sup>1</sup> Oh joy! Jesus of Nazareth passes by. Rome is penitent and proud no more. She sees on the eastern horizon the dawn of Pax Christiana.

ROBERT SETON, D.D.

---

### THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT AT THE COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

THE Columbian Exposition was a series of surprises. Not the least among them was the Catholic exhibition of education. This was specially surprising to those who, having in mind only the subtle processes of mental action, declare that education cannot be exhibited. They forget that behind all that is manifest of man to the eye there is a spirit; that, corresponding to all that is external and visible, there is the internal and unseen, which cannot be exhibited apart from its natural manifestations. In a sense, the real man is never seen by mortal eye; and yet, we are always discoursing about seeing men. The power of speech itself, by which the spirit declares its sentiments in words, depends very much upon what is unsaid, but suggested. The value of all exhibitions turns upon the power of the sense of sight—that "most perfect of all our senses," to which they appeal. For centuries, fairs used this sense in aid of trade. Articles were brought together in greater or less numbers or variety for inspection, sale, or purchase; but, in recent years, their service in the way of instruction has been recognized. Thus, great exhibitions now, not only mark epochs, but give incalculable impulse to progress. It has been said, that the great exhibition in London, in 1851, in which instruction was first made so prominent, was inspired by Prince Albert to help tide Great Britain over threatened industrial revolution. In this higher function, this use of educative power, education itself has become an object of exhibitions, not its subtle processes to be sure, any more than the unseen and inde-

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xi.

scribable processes of inventing the telephone, are set forth when that instrument is presented to the eye. If we reflect a moment, we notice that every time we compare teachers, schools, or their methods, or principles, in choosing for ourselves or our children, we are taking into account what can be seen, estimated, or measured. On this basis rests the setting forth of all educational claims. We can see and compare grounds, buildings, text-books, desks, laboratories, the thousand and one school appliances; the work of pupils which can be preserved in writing or drawing, and their work in wood, metals, textiles, clay, or stone, or the varied facts represented by statistics, or the manifold conditions which the camera can reproduce and preserve for examination. Indeed, in the Chicago exhibition we learned that the stenographer could report for us every word uttered by pupil or teacher, and describe every incident of the school-day's experience; and that the phonograph could report for us, in their very tones, the questions and answers, and the lessons in reading and music.

The Catholic exhibit of education was, moreover, a surprise for those who believe that the Catholic Church seeks its ends by concealed means. Here there was no concealment. Here, for the examination of every one who came, was the work of students in every subject taught, from those in the kindergarten to the most abstruse and profound in the professions—in the common branches, in history, local and general, ancient and modern, political and ecclesiastical; in church doctrines and sacraments; in the obligations of patriotism, and the sacredness of the oath. Here was the work; sometimes, in a most unchanged condition, just as it came from the hand of the pupil; and again, with the correction of the teacher added, showing both the work of the pupil and the method of the teacher; again, artistic illuminations were added, with pen and pencil. The work in wood was for the most common use, or for the sacred purposes of the altar; again, there are specimens of needlework, for the most common uses, or delicate laces and rich embroideries, or sacred vestments for priests or bishops; or, in crayon or oil, are the portraits of those eminent in the Church. At hand, were the schedules of schools in which the time occupied in each subject was given. The whole was an appeal to the American boasted fairness. It was saying to all the world, "Here is what we do; judge ye!"

Moreover, it was on the same floor, and in close proximity to the great public-school exhibitions; thus affording an excellent opportunity for comparison, which the friends of each should make without injustice to either. Few of the most devout Catholic visitors failed to find something unexpected as they studiously and reverently wandered through its alcoves and sought to gather

its lessons. They did not know that their own schools were so numerous, or comprehend the vastness of their work. Not only the great cities, and remote corners of the United States, but Hawaii, Mauritius, France, and other distant lands were represented. That the vastness of the collection faithfully represented the work done in the schools participating, could not be doubted by any one who, like the writer, had visited not a few of them, and reported many of them annually for half a generation.

Clearly, the exhibit is phenomenal; there has been none of church education like it. No one, who would estimate aright the educational force of the times, can ignore its significance. Its objects, manifestly, are manifold; but pre-eminently, it is an appeal to the judgment of mankind. There is no civil authority of city, state, or nation behind it; yet one idea pervades it, one authority has called it together and rules throughout the work it represents. This idea, this authority, has established the schools from which this material was collected, over against public schools and other private schools, and comes for an inspection of results.

Says the eminent Bishop Spalding in an able article, urging participation, "We shall thus place before the eyes of the millions who will visit the Exposition a clear demonstration of the great work the Church in the United States is doing to develop a civilization which is in great part the outgrowth of religious principles, and which depends for its continued existence upon the morality which religious faith alone can make strong and enduring. There can be little doubt that many are opposed to the Catholic system from the fact that they have never given serious attention to the principles upon which it rests or to the ends which it aims to reach. It is the fashion to praise education, and hence all declare themselves favorable to it; but those who have it enough at heart to make it a matter of thoughtful and persevering meditation, are like the lovers of truth, but few. But those who do not read seriously or think deeply may be got to open their eyes and look, and what they see may arouse interest and lead to investigation. Opinion rules the world, and the Catholic exhibit offers a means to help mould opinion on the subject of education, which is, in importance, second to no other; and in an age in which the tendency is to take schools from under the control of the Church and to put them under the control of the State in such a way as to weaken their religious character, nothing which may assist in directing opinion to true views upon this subject may be neglected by those who believe that education is essentially religious."

Here is a frank, direct statement for all, whether agreeing with it or not, and may well awaken thought and turn attention to the exhibit.

This is a period of facts, hard facts, if you please; and the exhibit, as a great fact, was intended to arrest attention and turn it to these schools and their methods. No statement, no statistics, no discussion ever conveyed such an idea of Catholic education as was here disclosed. It was a great object-lesson—not, indeed, education itself, but so near to it as to require no added description; but if that were desired, the catalogue could be procured of the indefatigable manager, or one of his assistants was at hand to answer questions.

The thoughts revealed by the exhibit in its many forms to the millions who saw it, are now on their travels through the civilized lands of the world, and will continue travelling while the memory of the collection remains in human minds. No one can compute its propagating power. It cannot, will not, everywhere produce the same impression. Some may be impelled only to find fault with it, to assail its object, to dwell on its deficiencies; but that is not attempted in this writing. Here it is sought to promote its influence in the direction of progress.

Improvement in education has in it a sign of betterment for mankind, which may hope to find a measure of favorable response even in those minds which are not attuned to the highest notes in the scale of service for our race.

Look more closely into the great collection.

Here are 29,214 square feet of floor-space so divided into 114 compartments or alcoves, and provided with shelving as to furnish 60,000 square feet of wall-surface and desk-room for the installation of an uncounted number of articles illustrating educational progress and conditions. One who undertook to record the enumeration of articles from 68 schools of the Christian Brothers found 5086 copy-books, 79 volumes of class work, 1008 separate sheets of drawings, 419 drawing books, 148 volumes of students' drawings and thirty large maps, together with 42 specimens of wood-work, 79 in iron, 14 in map engraving, 17 musical instruments, 24 in printing and binding, and 20 annals of agronomical stations, and so forth. Shall I enumerate the subjects taught in this group alone? In one of these schools, pupils are offered training in nineteen different trades. Schools for boys exhibit fifteen arts and twenty-six distinct and separate industries. In the schools under the direction of the Roman Catholic Church, in the United States alone, there may be said to be enrolled 800,000; a single society, the Sisters of Notre Dame, Milwaukee, showed by a great rising structure of bricks pictured on the wall, an attendance of 73,703.

The inscriptions of arch-diocese and diocese over the alcoves pointed at once to the subdivision of material in its installation, and illustrated the ecclesiastical loyalty of the teaching bodies. Twenty

dioceses were represented, seventeen teaching orders and a considerable number of separate institutions or schools, such as the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., the Papal College Josephinum, Columbus, Ohio; Miss M. L. Ash's Art School, Nashville, Tenn.; Catholic text-books, the Columbian Library of Catholic Authors, and the League of the Sacred Heart.

The three diocesan exhibits which most impressed visitors were those of Chicago, San Francisco and New York. The central attraction of the first was the statue of the archbishop in Carrara marble bearing the inscription, "Protector of our Schools." The statistical tables with the New York exhibit tell us that its schools possess \$4,000,000 of property and that their annual cost is \$260,000 and that there are within the diocese one hundred and sixty-eight parochial schools. The Fort Wayne diocese adds to the interest of its parochial schools exhibited by giving something of their history.

The general public never before had such an opportunity to gain so distinct an idea of the educational work of the several Catholic orders. Here one may study how each conducts instruction in its own sphere and all work in harmony and under one supreme authority. The influence of the exhibit upon the pedagogical principles and methods of the teachers of these schools, so evidently constantly in the minds of its chief promoters, was of incalculable importance.

Bishop Spalding, with effective urgency, declared: "The exhibit will help also to enlighten and stimulate teachers by diffusing among them a more real and practical knowledge of the various educational methods and appliances. It will arouse new interest in pedagogics as a science and an art. We may easily become the victim of the fallacy that a Catholic school is Catholic because this adjective is affixed to its name, or because in it prayers are said and catechism is taught. A poor school cannot exert a wholesome influence of any kind. Idle, inattentive, listless and unpractical children will not become religious however much they are made to pray and recite catechism. In a truly religious character self-respect, truthfulness, a love of thoroughness and excellence, a disinterested ambition are as important as a devotional spirit. When the natural virtues are lacking the supernatural have no proper soil in which to grow. A right school system does not of necessity make a good school. The aim is to advance the cause of Catholic education. We care little where or by whom the work is done."

No one would expect the work to be of uniform merit. Here was the inferior over against the superior. A brief statement like

this cannot go into detailed specifications of excellence. Volumes would be required. A large number of expert judges were occupied months with this task. The studious found ample opportunity for the application of that great educational principle, study by comparison. Did any one wish to look into the entire system of Catholic education in the United States or any part of it, and judge of its philosophical fitness? The material was at hand. Is any one agitating any of the numerous educational questions of the day? Here he might find valuable data to aid in the settlement. Are kindergarten methods sound and in themselves desirable? Do they give the pupil the advantage in the school years which follow or in the active pursuits of life? How far, if at all, may these principles be followed with older pupils? From various quarters there are kindergarten collections, but specially excellent from San Francisco.

In the comparison of schools does the early introduction of nature studies show any advantage? In these studies how far shall the pupil depend upon the object, picture or description? How early may the doctrines of the Church be taught? Are morals best taught by precept or example, or by both? What forms of punishment are best? At what age should the respective studies be begun? In penmanship shall the letters be sloping after the German or more upright after the English? Shall the first lessons in language be given by the abstract a-b-c method or by the use of words or sentences and in connection with pictures or objects? How far shall the advanced teaching of language be occupied in learning the rules of grammar or how far in memorizing choice selections or the construction of phrases and sentences or writing of compositions? Shall the earliest lessons in numbers or arithmetic be abstract or *memoriter* or by the use of objects? Do results show that there is any advantage in adapting the subject or method to the age or to the order of mental development? Do the schools in which church doctrine or church history is emphasized show corresponding advantage in conduct or in attention to other studies? Do the schools in which the teachers have a clear and well-defined conception of pedagogical principles and methods show corresponding superior results? Here, too, is room for indefinite comparison of sanitary conditions of grounds and buildings, of ventilation, heating and lighting, of long and short sessions for different ages, of postures, sitting and standing, of cultivating the reflective or expressive faculties or other powers in harmony or out of proportion.

What place shall be assigned geography, history, the natural sciences, and what is the best method of teaching each? What appliances and aids may be secured? In advanced courses of

study what should be the relation of natural sciences and the humanities? What shall be the place of modern languages and the method of studying them? How early may logic and metaphysics be introduced and by what methods best taught? How far may the principles of mechanics be used in connection with manual training? In the choice of studies, shall the principle of equivalents be regarded? How far should the selection of a subject depend upon its relation to other subjects in a definite course of study, and how far upon the purposes and aims of the pupils? Under what conditions is there the greater or less educational waste? How far can the teacher be responsible for physical conditions or culture? How shall the teacher know that the pupil's embarrassment in the class, or failure, is due to astigmatism or imperfections in hearing or other physical cause? How may gymnastics be used to advantage? In any scheme of education should manual training of boys and girls be omitted? If it is admitted, what relation should it hold to the other work? Should it aim to instruct in specific trades or in those principles or practices common to several or more trades? How far shall the training depend upon theory and how far upon practice? How far upon their combination? What is the educational advantage of sloyd? To what extent may girls be trained in domestic economy, in cooking, the making of garments, and in the art of nursing? Under what circumstances, at what time, and to what extent may the pupil give attention to the harp, piano, or singing, or fancy work as a mere accomplishment? How far can the general or specific results of school training be improved by careful adjustment of the relations of elementary, secondary, superior, and professional instruction to each other or to a general plan comprehensive of the whole? Do the several religious orders interchange comparisons of principles and methods to the greatest advantage? Do teachers visit each other's schools as much as they might to gain the greatest mutual benefit? How may schools of less merit be brought up to the standard of those of the highest? It is not to be expected that all or any of these questions will be settled beyond revision. The object is not so much final settlement as constant improvement—stimulating all everywhere and at all times to better effort. With note-book in hand, studious and conscientious educators or teachers might be seen at all times putting down their observations upon these or some of the manifold questions which occupy and perplex those interested in the management or instruction of schools. Were they skilled and at the front of their profession, they saw much to confirm them in their high endeavors. Did their work or method when thus brought into comparison appear inferior, what motives did they not find to incite them to gain the power of doing better

as they return to their labors? It should be remembered that the members of teaching orders are under strict professional rules; that they are separated from kindred and from common pursuits, and devote their lives to teaching without the usual expectation of pecuniary reward. With them there is no change of vocation. They have the advantage of a life-service to incite them to excel. The rules and systems of advancement in each order are intended to promote efficiency, on the principle that progress can only be assured in any vocation by the mastery of its profoundest or essential principles. The deeper the well, the surer the sight of stars. Here the advantage of studying diverse schools and methods is greatly enhanced by compact organization of the material and by the fact that it remains at hand unchanged for a minute and prolonged comparison. No doubt, many a member of the teaching orders gained broader and more profound views of the work and objects of his own order than it had been previously possible to attain. Bishop Spalding said, with emphasis: "It is not rash to hope that the Catholic educational exhibit will awaken new zeal, arouse a more generous spirit of sacrifice, inspire a deeper enthusiasm in the cause of Christian education, which is the cause of our country and of our religion."

Who could spend an hour in these alcoves without fixing memories to influence all his future thinking? Even children, however limited or hazy their ideas in the midst of this seemingly endless variation of school products, could not fail to gain impressions of the vast possibilities of education to follow them through life. Their daily tasks at school will have new significance. The impulse to be gained to school training in this way is not to be ignored. It may not be easy to put it down in figures, but it is none the less actual, positive, and abiding. Much will be done to extend its effect by the numerous newspaper notices and criticisms, whether favorable or unfavorable, American or foreign.

The many ways by which, through pen and pencil or needle or otherwise, the person, face, name, act or word of those eminent as officers in the Catholic Church or within its fold was presented told how surely the entire body of instructors of the schools of all grades and of every variety, acknowledge themselves in the bosom of their church. If this manifestation shall seem trivial to the casual observer, it has the significance of reality. The trivial in one view, may in another have solid import.

So of some of the fancy work, such as the harp made of shavings and the pictures in moss and pebbles. They show at least both ingenuity and application and point to the variety of instruction possible. To some, only the teaching of the three "R's" is admissible in any elementary school; any departure is worse than



trivial. For them, the teaching of any skill with the hands, either by theory or practice save that of penmanship, has no place in the school room. They condemn, unheard all, of this indication, of the industries of the farm and shop and business forms taught boys, and all the manifold use of the needle in making or mending garments or in embroidery and the making of lace or the training in household arts or economy, taught girls, to say nothing of the fancy work and accomplishments which they abhor. In this narrow view of school work, typewriting, stenography, and all other arts through which so many find means of self-support, would be excluded; but intelligent and broad minded parents and teachers will not surrender an advantage so important to their children as bread winners. They will go forward seeking only to do more wisely and effectively what they have undertaken. A critical but judicious examination will find in this vast collection of hand work, many suggestive lessons. There may be crude carving, but over against it is the carved high altar from the Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio. There may be crude work in brass, but there is the set of musical instruments made by pupils. There may be imperfect work in lace, or embroidery, but there are, over against it, specimens of high order, including those in silver and gold and set with gems from schools too numerous to mention. From the simplest industries, such as making brooms, and brushes, we may find illustrations such as plumbing, scroll and machine work, type-setting, printing, binding, and electrotyping. But if any are not satisfied with fancy work, or that in art of industry which shows improvement, they can find an abundance in the common or higher branches of education to occupy any spare time. They may begin with the simplest written work and find at each step upward, through all grades, enough to weary their hands with handling and their eyes with seeing. Let them remember at every step that what they should expect is not perfection, but the signs of striving towards it. The teacher does a great duty who inspires his pupils to unending advancement. Let every grade or form of instruction do this, and its work is not in vain. The mistake should not be made of classifying any of this work out of its place. The compositions of children acquiring the elements of a language, should not be judged by the standards of distinguished scholars, nor their struggles in elementary drawing or painting, by the canons of high art; nor the rude lines of a beginner in the parochial school be condemned because inferior to the elaborate drawings of a bridge complete in all its parts, for the use of the builder, as that exhibited by the La Salle Institute, of New York. The significance of many articles of this class is that they show that opportunities are afforded and that there are struggles to improve them. These

wide and varied opportunities, these many attempts, do not mean that every one is to be an artist, any more than the universal ability to read and write implies that every one is to be great as an orator or writer. No one can rise in either sphere without these elementary steps, and the more general their dissemination, the greater the chances for reaching those who are to be inspired to eminence. In this just view we may find many efforts of merit, and are made sure that where these opportunities are furnished, however elementary, there true science and true art have larger chance for appreciation and beneficent influence.

It would be interesting to trace the effect of the exhibit upon the several organizations of priests and the several orders of brothers and sisters here represented. At no point could these results be more manifest than in the training institutes, colleges, homes or mother-houses so to speak, of each organization. These communities are training schools for the new members of their respective orders. The formation of a religious life, the sundering of family ties, the acquisition of habits of thinking and acting in accordance with the objects and rules of the order, constitute necessarily no unimportant part of the preparation. In these orders for men and women in which teaching is an object, there is, as a rule, specific attention to the history of education, its principles and methods, the theory and practice of teaching. There journals of education may be found at hand, and books on pedagogy. The exhibit shows not only what is done at these centres, but will return a powerful impulse to improvement. What discussions and comparisons will then follow. It has also furnished an excellent opportunity to recall to this generation the triumphs in education of some of these orders in their early years. The educational reforms introduced by the Jesuit Fathers cannot be forgotten. More historic monographs would have been helpful. Naturally, the Brothers of the Christian Schools emphasize their remembrance of their great founder, Jean Baptiste De La Salle, by presenting recent issues of his works relating to the organization and management of schools. In one of these it is stated that he "was born in Rheims, France, April 30, 1651, and died at Saint Yon, April 7, 1719. He was the originator of: 1. The present work; 2. The mutual simultaneous method, 1682, although ascribed to Lancaster, Pestalozzi and Jacotot; 3. Primary schools, properly so-called; 4. Normal school, Rheims, 1684; 5. Technical schools and schools of design, Paris, 1699; Saint Yon, 1705; 6. Boarding schools and academies, Paris, 1698; Saint Yon, 1705; 7. Reformatory schools, Saint Yon, 1705; 8. Sunday schools, Paris, 1699; 9. The popular methods of teaching, catechetical, Socratic and practical. Object-lessons have also been anticipated by him, though to Froebel is accredited the

honor." Here may be studied the theories and the instructions of the great founder of this order touching the organization and conduct of schools with additions derived from the experience of nearly two centuries.

Of those American orders sharing in the exhibit, these brothers point to special preparation for teaching in California, in the Normal Institute at Martinez; in Maryland, at the Normal Institute at Ammendale; in Missouri, La Salle Institute, Glencoe; in New York, at St. Joseph's College, Amawalk. The Jesuit Fathers point to similar opportunities at Santa Clara College, San Francisco, Cal.; the Sisters of Charity to St. Joseph's Academy, Emmetsburg, Md.; the Sisters of Providence to St. Mary's Institute, St. Mary's, Vigo County, Ind.; the Ursuline Nuns to the convent, St. Louis, Mo.; the Visitation Nuns to their convents, Georgetown, D. C., and Brooklyn, N. Y. These will answer as illustrations, but space will not permit even an enumeration of all the houses and institutions where this special preparation is furnished, much less can the colleges and theological seminaries and other schools for higher training be named. It is doubtful whether the members of the teaching orders ever had previously any such opportunity of understanding the work of so many others or of gaining such aid from a study of evidence of their methods in their results. It goes without the saying that those that have done most for the exhibition are likely to be most interested in its study and to derive the greatest benefit from it. In different portions of the collection are evidences of the consideration given to the care of orphans or other unfortunate children. Lecouteulx, St. Mary's Deaf Mute School, at Buffalo, N. Y., under the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Ephpheta, of Chicago, Ill., under the Religious of the Sacred Heart, illustrate the instruction afforded this afflicted class. Are you interested in their instruction, you will be specially impressed with the excellence of a cabinet carved in hard wood by three pupils of the Ephpheta and in the chair-caning and wood-carving from the first-named institution.

The work for outcasts and those exposed to courses of crime is strikingly brought out by the exhibit of the New York Catholic Protectory of Westchester. Its department for boys is under the Brothers of the Christian Schools and that for girls under the Sisters of Charity. These children are withdrawn from exposure to want, disease and crime on the street, furnished with home care and comforts and taught the elements of education and a trade at the same time.

The fulness and excellence of the collection from the Colored Industrial School of Pine Bluff, Ark., left no doubt of the earnest and persistent efforts there made for improvement. The exhibition

from the Indian schools gave evidence of progress both in letters and industries.

The collections from Catholic temperance societies called attention to the efforts in this great reform.

If space permitted much might be said of personal exhibits of special interest. There was a diminutive wood-saw run by a diminutive engine, all the work of an Indian boy in a school taught by the Sisters of St. Joseph. In several instances relief maps might be seen made by pupils. Brother Alexis, of Carlsbourg, Belgium, exhibited, among aids to the study of geography, a submersible relief map. The La Salle Institute, New York, exhibited a successful illustration made by one of its professors of the development of solids by the use of marked and folded paper. Here, again, were collections of woods, minerals, leather; of cotton from the seed to the finished fabric; of grain—to aid in nature studies, such as those from St. Peter's School, Philadelphia, and others. The visitor of scientific tastes possibly would find greater satisfaction in the collections illustrative of work in the polytechnic schools, the colleges and theological seminaries.

The Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., may be mentioned as an illustration of the institutions which show the fulness of their courses step by step each year from the beginning in the preparatory department to the last of the senior studies in the four years of the college training.

The collection from Notre Dame University, Congregation of the Holy Cross, Notre Dame, Ind., was large and varied, and conveyed an idea of the grounds and appliances, as well as of the great variety of work done by the students in the different departments.

Manhattan College, New York City, made an exhibit which commanded the special attention of thoughtful visitors. Its several departments, including preparatory, business and the most advanced subjects taught, were well represented. Here was a translation in Latin of Grover Cleveland's inaugural address as President in 1893, and "Aristotle and the Christian Church," by Brother Azarias, whose death during the Exposition was so greatly lamented by all who knew him. From theological seminaries were examination papers in the most advanced theological subjects as well as Latin, Greek and Hebrew. A modest but instructive exhibit called attention to the Catholic University of America, at Washington, D. C. This university, intended to crown the entire system of Catholic education in the United States, has only a portion of its buildings erected and has opened fully only its theological department. Some work has been begun in philosophy. Realization of the purpose to bring here the most learned pro-

fessors to be found the world over, in the Catholic Church, in the subjects to be pursued, cannot fail to exert a powerful influence upon learning generally as well as upon all Catholic schools of whatever grade.

The text-books either published by Catholics or used in their schools were appropriately exhibited.

The Library of Catholic Literature attracted much attention.

The collection of books, letters, manuscripts, magazines, pictures, mitres, croziers, chalices, relics of priests, bishops, archbishops, cardinals and popes—articles associated with events or persons of special interest, illustrating the history of the Catholic Church and furnished from the Catholic historical collections of America, Notre Dame, Ind., and the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, specially attracted those disposed to historical inquiry. Here was a German Bible printed at Nuremburg in 1470; here was a copy of the first Catholic Bible printed in the United States, 1790, and the Bible used by Mother Seton, the first Sister of Charity in the United States, and a Catholic New Testament printed in English in 1682. Objects of special historic interest were also furnished from other institutions; from the Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., a specimen of printing in 1633; a portion of the Bible for the blind; the "*Syntagma Juris Universi*," 1609; *Imitation of Christ*, 1699; a polyglot edition of the *Imitation of Christ*, in eight languages; "*Paradisus Animæ Christianæ*," printed in 1675; the Bible in Latin and German, with annotations in Greek, printed in 1671.

From the Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio, there were noteworthy books, such as "*Saint Antoninus' Summa Theologica*," printed by Nicholas Jensen, 1479. The "*Exercitium Grammaticale Puerorum*," in the Gothic characters, with an explanatory text in Latin, printed in Germany, 1504; the debate between Dr. Eck and Dr. Martin Luther on the primacy of the Roman pontiff, which occurred in July, 1519, of which the book is understood to be the original record printed in Leipsic immediately afterward; the "*Chronicle of the Old Christian Churches*," from Eusebius, printed at Strasbourg in 1530, understood to be one of the oldest and first histories printed in the German language.

Any notice of the exhibition would be incomplete which did not bring into view the exercises of Catholic Education Day. These were held in Festival Hall, Jackson Park, under the auspices of the Columbian Catholic Education Committee, Bishop Spalding President and Brother Maurelian Secretary and Manager, and were presided over by Archbishop Feehan, of Chicago, with whom upon the platform were a large number of the most distinguished prelates of the country, together with representatives of the Direc-

tor-General and the lady managers, and others. The attendance was large, both of clergy and laity, and especially of members of the teaching orders of men and women. The speaking was able; the sentiments were stimulating to patriotism and to greater devotion and enthusiasm to Catholic education as a need both of the State and the Catholic Church. Dr. S. H. Peabody, Chief of the Department of Liberal Arts, in the place of the Director-General, commended the wisdom and efforts which had brought together so great and so effective an exhibit of Catholic education and cared for it so efficiently and faithfully. "You have done admirably. I think of the thousands of fingers and of minds which have been employed all over this land in the preparation of this exhibit."

The utmost emphasis was placed upon religious education by the distinguished speakers. Archbishop Hennessey remarked: "Education without religion is not a good tree." "How can you study nature properly if you put out of it nature's God, or the lives of men when you make no account of Him?" Archbishop Ryan said: "The vocations of secular and religious education have much in common. Both are destined to dispel ignorance, to enlighten and enlarge the human mind so that it may contemplate truth more perfectly, to refine and elevate our love of the true, the beautiful and the good. These two educations are thus far united in vocation and mission. They ascend the mountain of God together, for all knowledge, whether religious or scientific, is holy; for God is master in the temporal as in the spiritual order—God of the starry firmament as well as of the sanctuary. Behold these two lovers of truth ascending the mountain together. At a certain point marked by a cross by the wayside the secular teacher stops and says: "Thus far may I go and no farther. I must return to bring pupils to this point and here part with them." "Do not go back but give me thy hand," says the religious educator; "to these summits above us bathed in celestial light, let us ascend and see what newer and greater things our God has made, and let us hear His voice speaking to us." "Education, to be perfect," he continues, "must consider man in his entirety; must call out the heart-power as well as intellect power, and educate the great religious element within us, as real as either and partaking of both; and again, the Catholic Church, with the maternal instinct for the preservation of the spiritual life of her children, knows no sacrifice too great to be made for their religious instruction. You behold the result. Thousands of school-houses surmounted by the Cross, and second only in importance to our churches, are seen throughout the land. Many religious orders of men and women are devoted to the same work. You behold at the Columbian Exhibition some of the visible results of this remarkable self-sacrifice for the

cause of education. You see how charity can do more than gold."

Hon. M. J. O'Brien, of the Supreme Court of New York, dwelling on the fruits of religious education, said: "This idea or principle which, we believe will finally meet with the assent and approval of all thoughtful, right-minded men, is the Catholic contribution to education. This does not, let us repeat, place itself in antagonism to our public schools, nor does it in any way include the right of the State to teach religion."

Hon. T. J. Gargan, of Boston, speaking of "Catholicity and Patriotism," called attention to the part taken by the Catholic Archbishop Langton in securing, on the field of Runnymede, at the hands of King John of England, the Magna Charta; and to the efforts of the Catholics in Maryland; to the fact that a Catholic in one of our Colonial congresses, when the right of the king was affirmed, arose and asked, "What about the divine rights of the people?" He quoted from St. Thomas Aquinas the declaration that "the ruler has not the power of making law except inasmuch as he bears the power of the multitude"; Sir Thomas More, as holding that the king held his crown by Parliamentary title; and Suarez, as teaching that "whenever civil power is found in one man or legitimate prince, by ordinary right, it came from the people and community either proximately or remotely; it cannot be otherwise possessed so as to be just"; and finally Bellarmine, as saying "divine right gave the power to no particular man; it therefore gave the power to the multitude."

Bishop Spalding, in the midst of a few earnest remarks, said: "This system of ours is an opportunity of our religious life. What does America mean? It means boundless opportunities. That is the only meaning I have for America. If it is better than any other land, it is because here is a fuller opportunity to bring forth whatever makes man God-like; whatever makes him intelligent, moral, religious, praying, true, loving, beautiful, and fair—opportunity. That is America."

Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker greeted the assembly in behalf of the Lady Managers.

Manifestly it would be difficult to devise a more effective voicing or representative interpretation of the Catholic exhibit as "a great achievement." Whether the exhibit is to result in the establishment of a magazine devoted to the improvement of Catholic schools is not yet manifest.

Before leaving this great study, one wishes an answer to the question so often recurring at different points of investigation: How did all this come about? Certainly not by chance; not without difficulty and sacrifice; not without experience and a high order

of wisdom. The expense and management were wholly from the Church. No civil authority participated in it.

As the idea of the great Columbian Fair became more definite, it appears that several Brothers of the Christian Schools were conferring together, when it was suggested that the Catholic schools should participate in the exhibition—perhaps by Brother Maurelian. Certain it is that he had been officially called to bear an important part in the educational exhibit at New Orleans. The idea was approved by Archbishops Feehan and Ireland, and Hon. W. J. Onahan was requested to bring the matter to the attention of the archbishops at their meeting in Boston, July, 1890. The sanction of the Metropolitans was given, and a committee of their number called a conference of priests and religious orders and others interested. Several meetings of distinguished educators were held, and a circular was issued by a duly appointed committee to arouse general interest.

Progress was reported at the meeting of archbishops at St. Louis in December, 1891, and executive officers were designated. The learned and eloquent Bishop J. L. Spalding, of Peoria, Ill., was unanimously called to act as president, and the able and indefatigable Brother Maurelian, President of the Christian Brothers' College, Memphis, Tenn., was appointed secretary and manager. He had followed with great interest the effect of the New Orleans educational exhibit upon the schools of the country, and he was peculiarly prepared by nature and acquirements for the difficult task—able, scholarly, willing to work, courteous, of untiring patience, full of resources, quick to plan and to do, profoundly convinced of the unmeasured good to come from the exhibit, his fitness as general manager was never questioned, but heartily commended by all who had anything to do with him.

Bishop Spalding's masterly pen aroused enthusiasm. The highest authorities in the Church emphasized their approval.

Every courtesy was extended to the promoters of the exhibit by S. H. Peabody, LL.D., Chief of the Department of Liberal Arts, that was in his power, but the management of the Exposition was slow to provide adequately for education, and not a few educators became discouraged; but through all the period of uncertainty, Brother Maurelian's faith and patience were equal to the situation. The marvellous installation was effected, and the tide of visitors set in. No matter what differences and uncertainties arose to confuse, divert, or discourage, Brother Maurelian kept the end steadily in view. His plans were ready for every contingency.

By his forethought, the several orders, schools, and exhibits were fitted to the plan of awards, and the result is manifest in



the proportionately large number of medals and diplomas received. The largest and the smallest, the nearest and the most remote, exhibitor could bear testimony that no effort was spared on the part of the manager and his associates to do equal justice. Many mistakes were corrected. The most trivial questions of the curious visitors, the most exacting demands of the judges, were met cheerfully, at whatever cost of convenience and labor. Brother Maurelian, until the last act was closed, in spite of sleepless nights and loss of health, abated no one jot or tittle of required effort.

GEN. JOHN EATON, PH.D., LL.D.

---

#### THE RECENT DECREES ON CHURCH MUSIC.

TWO important documents on the subject of Church music have recently emanated from the Congregation of Sacred Rites. They were, first, a decree concerning the official editions of the choral books of the Church ; and, second, a general Regulation in regard to the composition and execution of ecclesiastical music. Although both of these pronouncements were enclosed in a circular letter to the Bishops of Italy, it is proper to note here that they were of very unequal legal application ; for while the *Regulation* was formally addressed only to the Ordinaries of the dioceses of Italy, and has therefore only a very limited legal scope, the decree on Gregorian chant concerns the whole Church.

However different in their import and scope, they may be considered as forming together a valuable exposition of the mind of the Holy See in a matter which has been the subject of very much controversy. The story of abuses in Church music is an old one. It has called forth comment and criticism, both clerical and lay.

And, perhaps, despite these recent utterances of the Sacred Congregation, the history shall still repeat itself ; perhaps rigorist and laxist alike may find in them a desirable suffrage ; and they may prove a demonstration to him who, with one ear open to the beauties of plain chant, ventures to think that he can catch with the other many suggestions of heavenly harmony in the sacred compositions of more modern schools of music. But it is confessed on all sides that there is a palpable necessity of some revision, some reformation—perhaps, literally an *orientation*—of the present state of Church music. While the professors and doctors are

fighting the question out on technical lines, be ours the humbler task to take merely a lay view of the subject, and to indulge, at the same time, some unscientific yearnings.

Any one who is familiar with the periodical Catholic literature of the last quarter of a century, must have noticed many a discussion—ranging from a few isolated paragraphs to the formal series of articles—of music-reform in the Church. The discussion was not always just, and was very rarely temperate. Perhaps it is inseparable from the reformer to be something of a zealot. But in addition, the tone adopted was not unfrequently merry and jocose. When Brutus had poured forth the torrent of his anger on Cassius, we remember how Shakespeare makes the quarrel assume the merry phase—and so, when reasoning seemed to have expended itself into failure, the modern Brutus of "reform" began to use the refractory Cassius of Church music, "for his sport, yea, for his laughter." A rather unfortunate aspect of the quarrel began to develop itself, wholly outside of the manners, the "amenities" of the discussion. This was the fact—an unfortunate one, as we have just said—that no common ground was suggested for the desired reform. For there was, first of all, the implacable devotee of Gregorian Song, who rode in this modern tournament in the full panoply of a mediæval knight. He was the representative of venerable antiquity, of ecclesiastical discipline, and of a grand, unbroken tradition of liturgical glories. But too often, alas! his armor seemed to sit heavily upon him; his battle-cry seemed but an echo of syllogistic scholasticism; and so, although it might indeed draw its appropriateness from a very intelligible association of ideas, it fell as a strange idiom on the sense of a less reasoning age. Men may be convinced, but will rarely be moved, by a syllogism. Personally, we are not wholly disinclined to sympathize with his ideal. But we think that in such a matter as music, which is, in some respects, a question of taste, of æstheticism, it was inadvisable to cry out too strenuously and too insistently : *Aut Cæsar aut nullus*.

Then there was the advocate of the Palestrinesque style. He loved plain chant, but would not be exclusive in his preferences. The delights of a harmony whose tonalities and modal characteristics lifted it out of any vulgar association with present-day counterpoint, seemed to him not a thing to be only tolerated but to be desired as well in those temples which had erst heard but the simple unison of Gregorian chant. His principle might be stated in the words of Mr. Rockstro: "Since the downfall of the Polyphonic Schools the true Church style—the 'Stilo alla Capella' of the sixteenth century—has lain entirely dormant."

Then there was the devout client of Palestrina, who, however,

imitated the "Prince of Church Musicians" afar off; who followed the grave, sweet style of the master, but did not disdain to confine himself wholly to modern modality. Plain chant and Palestrina were alliterations very dear to his musical sense, and represented to him all that was proper, pure, and pious in the performance of the musical part of the liturgy.

These three schools represented the major part of those who labored for "the proprieties" of divine service. The whole Catholic world felt their influence; and their progress in numbers and in power and in a most praiseworthy zeal for a genuine reform in Church music was signalized by the establishment of societies, schools and periodicals devoted to this one end of reform. In France the reform set in a tidal wave towards primitive plain chant. It was hotly urged that the only music to be tolerated in the churches was the Gregorian chant. Even the *style palestrinesque* was an infringement on the sacred prerogatives of the ancient melodies of the Church. Again, not even the official edition urged by the Holy See for adoption by all the churches was deemed a suitable return to the traditions of the Ages of Faith. The *primitive* chants of St. Gregory, indicated with much real acumen, and with the indefatigable labors of zealous antiquarians and archæologists (words, we are assured by one French writer on Church music, which possess in this matter a widely different meaning), were the only real Church music worth battling for.

In Germany (and in those lands which followed the more liberal scheme of reform inaugurated there by Dr. Proske, J. G. Mettenleiter and Director Schrems of the Ratisbon Cathedral), Palestrina, and his school, and a modern approach to his style, formed a cult growing side by side with the study of plain chant. The most significant name in this revival was that of Rev. Francis Witt, whose writings and whose musical compositions and great ability as an organizer and director of the Society of St. Cecilia, soon enrolled in its membership 10,000 zealous disciples from the provinces of Germany alone.

America followed next in order in the more moderate view of the scope of music-reform in the Church. Shortly after, Ireland declared allegiance to the new order. Other suffrages came pouring in to the new movement from all quarters. The society had its organs published now in many different tongues, and much enthusiasm spurred it on to further efforts.

As it is our purpose just at this place merely to refer to the different schools of reform, we may not tarry longer to speak of the details of their activity. All these schools were united in one thing, however,—their uncompromising hostility to the popular styles of music performed in the churches. Haydn, Mozart,

Beethoven, and their lesser imitators; Pacini, Cimarosa, and the whole Italian school; needless to say, "the god, Rossini;" even the semi-classical Pergolesi; Gounod, mystic, devotional; Cherubini, sweet and melodious; Weber, now cheerful, now sombre—these, and the many other names that are associated with the musical reminiscences of most church-goers, were swept aside from notice, sometimes with a laugh, sometimes with a sneer, sometimes with a labored apology.

Another phase of the reform movement presented itself in the labors of those who advocated congregational singing. The simplicity of plain chant and the simplicity of easy and popular hymn-tunes of the present day offered a feasible return to more devotional and edifying services in the Church. It was argued that the best reform would be obtained when the people themselves should be permitted to assume their ancient rôle and prerogative as an integral part of the ceremonial observances. To this end, not alone the modern, but even the polyphonic, schools must give place to unison congregational chants.

Meanwhile, the defenders of the existing order were not idle. Merriment was answered by merriment, tradition by tradition, æsthetics by æsthetics. *De gustibus* became a retort courteous to the epithets, "operatic," "trashy," "sensuous." Plain chant was relegated to seminaries and monasteries, Cecilian music was voted a bore. The polemic ink flowed freely. And side by side with the severest strains of the elder music the more modern, as well as the very modern, trills, *bravuras* and sensuous cadences continued with unabated prestige to charm the ears of—shall we say *congregation* or *audience*? As we are not taking sides, we shall beg the reader to select the term he likes best. We have been trying thus far to prepare the way for the reader to understand the significance of the recent authoritative utterances in this matter of church music—utterances which, we are assured, proceeded from a very careful consideration, and after a thorough discussion, of the matter by the Congregation of Rites in full session.

The general spirit of the *Regulation*, and, indeed, of the *Decree*, might be styled "tolerant" in a very high degree. The prophetic utterances of newspapers, the private knowledge of correspondents, the calm convictions of editors, all pointing to a rigorous return to Gregorian originals, received but slight fulfilment and slight encouragement from the event itself. Perhaps the most striking of all the journalistic predictions was an article in the *Journal des Débats*, published almost on the eve of the actual appearance of the documents themselves: "Pope Leo XIII. is preparing an encyclical in which, if we may credit the news from Rome, he would severely condemn the execution of worldly music (*des musiques*

*profanes*) in the churches and recall all Catholic maîtrises to the practice of a truly religious art. . . . The orchestra, introduced into the churches, is a misconception. All that tumult of instruments reverberating from stone walls shall never express confiding love, serene faith, and, to say all in one word, it shall never be a prayer. . . . The Roman or ogival vaulting of cathedrals is not suited for the splendors or graces of modern symphony. (The orchestra is only in place in certain present-day churches, which resemble theatres rather than temples)." The article from which the extract has been made is quite lengthy, and this fact shows the general interest felt in the forthcoming encyclical, which could make space in a secular journal for such a peculiarly religious topic treated in such an uncompromising spirit. The newspapers on this side of the Atlantic heralded the decrees with similar evidence of a deep and widespread interest—an interest which they partly satisfied and partly awakened. In view of this general notice given to the matter of church music, it will scarcely be amiss to review the decrees in question and to endeavor to point their moral.

#### THE DECREE.

The decree concerned itself with plain chant, and, specifically, with the official edition of the Roman choral books published by Pustet & Co. To understand the significance of this latest utterance of the Congregation of Rites, it will be necessary to review summarily the history of that reform movement in church music which contemplated both a restoration of the Gregorian melodies to a dignified, simple and devotional original, and a very desirable uniformity throughout the church in this part of her Liturgy.

In the course of the centuries which elapsed since the time of St. Gregory the Great, the official edition of the chants prepared by him—the celebrated Antiphonary, which he caused to be chained to the altar of St. Peter's as a standard for reference in future years—failed of the desired effect. For the system of notation employed in it—the *neumata* or *nota Romana*—however much of an advance over the labyrinthine musical semeiography of the Greeks, was itself open to the essential defect of a variable interpretation. Let the reader imagine a series of musical signs consisting of different combinations of the acute, grave and circumflex accents, possessing not a grammatical but a musical value and subject to those changes in form, which, in the course of time, a hasty, careless chirography or an artistic but variant calligraphy cannot fail to produce, and he will begin to understand some of the difficulties thrown in the way of an absolute standard of Gregorian chant. Add to this the absence of a staff, and,

in the begining, of even a single line above the text to be sung, and the consequent uncertainty of the distances separating the notes from each other, which brought in a new element of difficulty in addition to the uncertain determination of the names of the notes. The tradition must be perfect to an extraordinary degree, which should preserve unaltered the original chants of St. Gregory. In the lapse of years we find that the chant must have reached a highly variant condition, if that remark of a certain Monk of Triers, quoted by Gerbert, was not wholly a witticism, that "the same marks which Master Trudo sung as thirds, were sung as fourths by Master Albinus, and Master Solomo in another place asserts the fifths to be the notes meant, so that at last there were as many methods of singing as teachers of the art."

This indeterminateness was partially removed by the placing of a line above the text, and subsequently by the addition of a second line, in the tenth century. To these Guido of Arezzo added two other lines, forming the present four-lined staff of Gregorian chant. By placing the *neumata* on and between the lines he secured that definiteness which could alone remove the former ambiguous character of notation. He was also the inventor of a method of teaching the chants and of training chanters which, compared to the former vogue, must have been simplicity itself. For in a single lesson by his method he taught the reigning Pontiff, Pope John XIX., how to sing at sight an unknown melody—an achievement which would have proved almost a life task to the theorists of his time.

At last, one might conclude, plain chant was placed in such a commanding position of intelligibility and feasibility as to ensure a universally correct and unique rendition of it. But alas! side by side with these reforms in notation there was growing up the young art of harmony, which was destined ultimately to use the Gregorian melodies as a mere background for an infinitely varying play of tonal lights and shadows, and which was to employ their gracefully unequal rhythms as foundation-stones, heavy and rudely shaped into an unmeaning similarity of rhythm, for a superstructure of renaissance fancifulness rich in splendid marbles and delicate tracery. It is not to be wondered at if the chant suffered thus much alteration. The rude *organum* of Hucbald could not but take away much of its free recitative rhythm. Then came the harmonic advance of the *faux bourdons*, in which, at first, as in the *organum*, the chant melody was dominantly heard. Gradually, however, parts were placed over the melody, and while the chant "dragged its slow length along"—very much like the wounded snake of Pope's *Alexandrine*—a melodic character was given to the accompanying parts by making them move, not note

for note with the chant as formerly, but in unequal measures. Thence arose the *discant*—discantus or double song—which, in the course of time, emerged from its babyhood of Gregorian leading-strings into the full-grown estate of an *aria*, or *air*, for which, by the way, the word *discant* was used in earlier English. We need not speak just here of the further liberties taken with the chant melodies by the contrapuntal treatment which soon followed the *discant*, and which, while at times using the melodies as fundamental to the arabesque harmony, at other times varied it and overlaid it beyond recognition. Then began that series of abuses with which the history of modern music is more immediately concerned; which called forth decree after decree from the Church; which have not, indeed, a perfect, but—in some respects—a similar counterpart in the abuses which called forth the *regulations* recently issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

But now, confining our attention to the significance of the *decree* concerning, not modern music, but plain chant, we can begin to understand how, in the lapse of ages, the original chants of St. Gregory, as well as the proper manner of performing them, became altered very materially; how the various “uses” of different dioceses grew up and flourished; how not merely the melodies themselves suffered, now additions, now curtailments, now manifold mutilation, but how the execution became largely a matter of the personal taste of choir-masters; and how, finally, in some places, it approached to the freedom and gayety of modern rhythms and melodies, and in other places sank into a dull, monotonous, unrhymical, and therefore unmelodic, declamation.

The recent decree reminds us that the Holy See always viewed this gradual corruption of the chants with alarm. Whatever toleration and acceptance of nascent harmony there was on her part, she desired that the chant itself should remain true to the traditions of the elder simplicity and rhythm. A decree issued by Pope John XXII., at Avignon, in the year 1322, states very well the apprehensions excited by the performances of the *âchanteurs* of that time, and the desire on the part of the Church that the integrity of the chant should not be lessened. “Some disciples of the new school, whilst they are careful to measure their time, invent new notes of their own, which they elect to sing in semi-breves and minims in preference to the ancient notation of the chant. They cut up the melody with interruptions, they overload it with *descant*, and with triplets and vulgar ornamentations they sometimes disfigure it; so that they appear to despise the foundations of the Gradual and Antiphony. They know not on what foundations they are building. They cannot distinguish the tones (modes); yea, they confound them, since, by the multitude

of their notes, the modest ascents (*ascensiones pudicæ*) and temperate descents (*descensiones temperatæ*) of the plain chant, by which the modes are distinguished, are obscured. They execute in gestures what they wish to convey, so that the devotion to be sought after is condemned, and the wantonness which should be avoided is propagated. We have determined, therefore, to correct this and to drive out of the Church of God this gross abuse. Wherefore we enjoin that no one henceforward shall presume to attempt such or similar liberties with the music of the Church, especially during the Divine Office or during the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. . . . By this we do not intend to convey that sometimes, especially on festival days, in Solemn Mass and in the Divine Office, some consonances may not be employed which are melodious and based upon the plain chant; so, however, that the integrity of the chant itself may remain unaltered, and that nothing of this well-measured music be changed."<sup>1</sup> Other and worse abuses followed, which we need not refer to now, and which called forth a decree from the Council of Trent concerning rather polyphonic music than plain chant.<sup>2</sup>

But the spirit of liturgical reform was abroad, and in the domain of the ancient ecclesiastical chant found much to engage its attention. The hundreds of local and variant "uses," while succeeding at times in adding to the body of chants some melodies of rare beauty, were really in the nature of so many abuses in liturgy. They partially took away from the liturgy its significance as a unique and universal expression of the unity of the Church. But apart from the question of liturgical unity, these uses were, even in a musical sense, deserving of the name of abuses. We have already heard the lament of the monk of Triers, quoted by Gerbert. Strong of language as he was in his witty moods, he was little less so in his serious moments. "We are perfectly sure," he wrote, "that through the ignorance of some the chant is very often corrupted in such wise that there are now more perverters of it than we can number." In addition to those whose ignorance or carelessness or vanity tended to the gradual extinction of the old melodies, there were the mediæval composers, who furnished, in the chants they composed for new offices, endless contradictions to the spirit and character of the original chants of St. Gregory. This state of musical and liturgical decadence called forth the energetic labors of Pope Pius V. Desiring to carry out practically the reforms indicated by the Council of Trent, he ordered a complete revision of the Antiphonary and the other liturgical

<sup>1</sup> *Extravag. Comm.*, lib. iii., tit. i. Trans. in *Echo*, vol. i., No. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ab ecclesiis vero musicas eas, ubi sive organo, sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur . . . arceant (sc. episcopi).



books. Under his successor, Gregory XIII., Palestrina, who also figures in the history of music as the Prince of Musicians and the Saviour of Modern Ecclesiastical Music, was charged with the immense burden of this work of critical investigation and correction. It is questioned whether the genius and temper of mind of Palestrina were suited to such a task, and, indeed, whether his learning fitted him for the decision of nice questions which had not a little flavor of antiquarianism lingering around them. At all events, certain it is that his work, while it met the approval of the Pope, has added but questionable laurels to his crown. He completed a portion of the *Graduale* chants, while he entrusted to his pupil, Guidetti, the task of revising and editing the *Antiphonary*. "The difficulty of the task was so great," writes Mr. Rockstro, "that the 'Princeps Musicæ' left it unfinished at the time of his death; but with the assistance of his friend, Guidetti, he accomplished enough to render his inability to carry out the entire scheme a matter for endless regret." Quite a different view of his work is taken by Th. Nisard: "Unhappily, in comparing the chants of the *Graduate* with those of the *Antiphonarium*, Palestrina believed it necessary to reduce the former to the simplicity of the latter. The Pope shared the opinion of the *prince of musicians*, but the result was far from the hopes which both had conceived; 'for,' says M. Fetis, 'after the suppression of all the ornamental notes which have been thought to belong to the first drafting of the chant, there remained only dry and monotonous melodies.'"

An edition of the Antiphonary published at Venice in 1580, known as the Lichenstein edition, gave a new turn to the activity of Guidetti, who published soon after his *Directorium Chori*.

Other editions followed. In 1599 the celebrated printer of Antwerp, Plantin, brought out the *Graduale*, known as the *Editio Plantiniana*. In 1615 appeared the splendid Medicean edition of the same chants. "These fine editions are now exceedingly scarce; but the necessity for a really good series of Office-Books, obtainable at a moderate price, has long been felt, and several attempts have been made to meet the exigencies of the case." The present century has witnessed a marvellous revival of interest in the study of Plain Chant.

The interest has been antiquarian, classical, devotional, æsthetic. The need has been felt, not only of cheaper editions, but of a single authoritative edition which should be a practical exposition of the best traditions of Gregorian Chant, and should by its adoption in all the Churches, manifest the unity of the Church Liturgy in this very essential portion of it. But alas! as often happens in the case of revivals and reforms, the revivalists and reformers are too apt to ride individual and opposing hobbies to death; the spirit

of schools, the *esprit de corps* of narrow circles, the traditional "uses" of various dioceses and the venerable character conferred on them by age and associations, the warring elements of nationality, the peculiar views of savants and antiquarians—all these disturbing and refractory influences have brought about a confusion worse than the earlier errors. And so there appeared (in several senses) *wrong editions* of the Chant.

In 1848 a Gradual and Vespers were published at Mechlin (Malines), edited by the Abbé de Voght and Duval, with episcopal sanction. This was followed by an edition prepared by Père Lambillotte and his continuator Père Dufour. A commission appointed by the Archbishops of Rheims and Cambrai produced another edition. The Mechlin edition did not go beyond the limits of the Medicean and Plantinian editions, and was therefore quite modern compared both with the work of the Cambrai editors, who based their work on the famous MS. of Montpellier of the 10th century, and with the labors of Lambillotte, who went back to even earlier centuries in an endeavor to find the most authentic chants. The controversies aroused by both of these attempts at a simplified chant were heated and prolonged. A large discussion of their respective merits is given in M. Félix Clément's *Histoire Générale de la Musique Religieuse*, who awards the palm of merit to Père Lambillotte's work. France was especially prolific in new and extremely variant editions. Concerning the editions of Rennes, of Dijon, of Digne, and of Malines (Mechlin) of 1848, 1854, 1855, M. Clément has not a very encouraging word to say; they all are, according to him, only "le chant momifié." And he laments that the only apparent fruit of the many attempts at another authoritative edition of the Chants was the existence in France alone, of six or seven different revisions of the Chant—not (let us add on our own account) to speak of the manner of execution!

Pope Pius the IX. had very much at heart the unification of the Chant, and its identification with the version used in the Roman Church. He accordingly desired the Congregation of Sacred Rites to deal with the matter; and the Congregation established a commission of men well versed in the theory and history and traditions of the Gregorian Chant, to take up the question, and edit a complete series of Liturgical Books which should be authoritative. The Medicean and Venetian (Lichtenstein) editions were followed—the former for the Gradual, and the latter for the Chants of the Divine office. Herr Pustet of Ratisbon placed at the disposal of the congregation all the magnificent resources of his great publishing house, with the result of a series of Liturgical works unexcelled in elegance of typography.

The Pope urged on all the Bishops of the world the immediate adoption of this "genuine, complete, official edition" of the choral books, "in order that the desired uniformity in the sacred liturgy should obtain in the chant as well, *ut exoptata uniformitas in S. Liturgia, etiam in cantu obtinere valeat*." Many dioceses followed the expressed will of the Pontiff, notably, the Synods of Westminster (1873), and of Maynooth (1875).

But the antiquary was abroad! His spirit was, we think, well indicated in the desire expressed by M. Nisard, that there should be a return to the Roman chant, "lorsque celui ci sera convenablement restauré." He insists, in a footnote, on the word *convenablement*—"Nous insistons sur cette condition." These words, written before the appearance of the official edition, and long before the decree authenticating and urging it, might well have been a prophecy of the storms of opposition raised since in certain quarters against that edition. It was urged that only the genuine chants of antiquity should be made authoritative, and that the editors of the Medicean and Venetian (Lichtenstein) books were not in a position to discover the true ancient melodies. The discovery of new manuscripts in our own century, the spirit of inquiry and painstaking investigation, the better equipment of the modern archæologist for the determination of authentic chants, the widespread interest excited in the work—all these constituted so many pleas against the formal acceptance by the Holy See and the consequent imposition upon all the churches of editions which, it was claimed, represented the comparative ignorance and ill-formed taste of a locality and an epoch. The commission of cardinals established by Pius IV. for the practical accomplishing of the resolution of the Council of Trent concerning the reform of the liturgical chant fell under the censure of one devotee of the "most ancient" chant. One of the most influential members of the commission, St. Charles Borromeo, did not, said his French critic, understand the Gregorian chant at all! "and so a gross error was committed 300 years ago, and the ecclesiastical chant has suffered ever since from the incapacity of the cardinals in this matter"!

To understand the insistence of the Holy See on this edition, it is proper to call to mind the fact that the pretence is not made that it represents exactly the original chants of St. Gregory. This, indeed, is a question for the antiquary to settle. But the Congregation of Rites simply sets the seal of approbation on an amended and reformed chant, such as the Council of Trent desired when it suggested "that the chant should be reduced to a simpler and apter form, that so it might be received and adopted the more readily by those who were concerned with divine psalmody" (*ut cantus*

*ejus modi ad aptiorem simplicioreque formam reduceretur, et ita ab omnibus divinæ psalmodiæ operam dantibus recipi adoptarique facile possct.*

At the risk of fatiguing the reader (but with an apologetic desire for clearness) we venture to quote largely from the decree of the 10th of April, 1883, in answer to the complaints urged against the official edition. After speaking of the sanction given by Pope Pius IX. to the choral books published under his auspices, this decree continues :

“ Meanwhile, several admirers of ecclesiastical music began to inquire more deeply as to the original form of Gregorian chant and the various phases of its existence in the course of centuries. But they unwisely exceeded the limits of this investigation, and, carried away, perhaps, by an undue reverence for antiquity, appeared to neglect the recent ordinances of the Apostolic See and its wishes, so frequently manifested to introduce uniformity of chant according to the form sanctioned by the most prudent use of the Roman Church. They, forsooth, considered that putting aside the standard already wisely established, they were at liberty to strive that the Gregorian Chant should be brought back to its primitive form, and with the further intention that the Apostolic See, however it might declare authentic and strongly recommend the chant of the edition recently approved by it, would not impose it of necessity on the several churches ; they failed to remember, as indeed they should have done, that it is the constant practice of the Supreme Pontiffs, when there is a question of removing abuses, to act rather by persuasion than by command, especially as they know full well that the bishops and priests are piously and religiously accustomed to interpret the Pope's exhortations as a command. As these opinions were being widely circulated through the newspaper press and in numerous pamphlets published on the subject, and calling into question the nature of the approbation given to the above-mentioned edition, the Sacred Congregation considered it a duty to declare the apostolic letters already published by Pius IX., of sacred memory, authentic, and again to confirm the approbation of the said edition by a new decree issued on the 14th of April, 1877.

“ Nevertheless, neither in this decree nor in the subsequent apostolic letters of our most Holy Father, above mentioned, were they willing to acquiesce ; on the contrary, they continued to promote their views still more actively in a congress of upholders of ecclesiastical chant, which was held last year in Arezzo whilst public honors were being paid to the monk Guido, and not without giving offence to those who justly deem that the authority of the Holy See is to be exclusively followed in the method and uni-

formity of its chant not less than in other matters affecting the sacred liturgy. But, whatever may have been intruded into that congress which may merit disapprobation, those who met at Arezzo drew up certain resolutions, or *postulata*, to be humbly laid before our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., seeking his direction. Our most Holy Father, considering the gravity of the matter, commissioned a special body of certain cardinals, selected from those who constitute the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and certain prelates, officials of the same congregation, to examine into the question. This special congregation assembled at the Vatican on the under-mentioned date, and, having carefully considered the subject, examined all documents referring thereto and taken the opinions of learned men, thus decreed, subject to the approbation of the Supreme Pontiff.

"The *Vota* or *Postulata*, adopted in the Congress of Arezzo last year, with the object of bringing back the liturgical chant to ancient tradition, and submitted to the Apostolic See, cannot, as they are worded, be received or approved of. For, although it always has been, and ever will be, open to students of ecclesiastical chant, for erudition's sake, to investigate the old, original forms of the chant and its successive phases—just as men learned in other departments are accustomed, with the happiest results, to discuss and investigate concerning the old rites of the Church and the several parts of the liturgy—nevertheless, that form only of Gregorian chant is to be held to-day as authentic and legitimate which, according to the Tridentine sanctions by Paul V., Pius IX., of sacred memory, and our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., and by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, has been ratified and confirmed, as in accordance with the edition recently published at Ratisbon, and alone containing that form of chant used by the Roman Church. Wherefore, as regards this authenticity or legitimacy, there can be no further doubt or question amongst those who sincerely wish to respect the authority of the Holy See. Moreover, in order that the chant which is used in the Sacred Liturgy, in the strict sense of the term, may be uniform everywhere, in all the new editions of missals, rituals, pontificals, etc., those parts which require to be printed with musical notes must be executed in accordance with the aforesaid edition, approved by the Holy See, because containing the liturgical chant proper to the Roman Church (as the title affixed to each volume declares), and be perfectly conformable to that text. For the rest, although according to the most prudent course always adopted by the Holy See when there is question of introducing uniformity in the liturgy, she may not impose the use of this edition on every church, nevertheless, she again strongly exhorts all most reverend ordi-

naries and others interested in ecclesiastical chant that they be solicitous to adopt this edition, as many places have already praiseworthy adopted it in order to promote uniformity of chant in the Sacred Liturgy, and thus it decreed on the 10th day of April, 1883.

"A report of these proceedings being submitted by the undersigned secretary to our most Holy Father, Leo XIII., Pope, his Holiness approved and confirmed the decree of the Sacred Congregation and ordered it to be published on the 27th of the same month and year."<sup>1</sup>

One might reasonably have supposed that this pronouncement would definitely settle the disputes. But the endless arabesques of the elder chants (one apologist asserts that the old manuscripts cited by the critics exhibit in ten instances four hundred and ninety-one notes, whereas the Medicean edition has reduced them to sixty) seemed still to prove too powerful an attraction! And, accordingly, new disputes arose. The decree issued this year insists on the declaration of the former decree of a decade ago, and as far as decrees and exhortations can go the question of official liturgical chant is finally settled.

This decree, then, expresses the will of the Holy See with regard to all the churches, but does not impose that will as an obligation. Nevertheless, it seems to us, such an expressed desire should suffice instead of an obligation; and whatever progress be made in the determination of the exact chants of St. Gregory, whatever wealth of ancient glories be brought to light through the zealous labors of the antiquarian or the archæologist, whatever spur be given by those labors to an increased love for the *official* chant of the Church, an awakened interest in its career, a laudable wish to place it in an honored position before the people—all these desirable ends should never be permitted to obscure that one practical, authoritative means to a unity of liturgical observances proposed by the Holy See in issuing its official edition of the Roman chant. Those who are zealous lovers of the chant and who would gladly see it assume its old, exclusive *rôle* as the only musical drapery of the liturgical texts, shall find a large field for their energies in the propagation of one accepted edition. With this desideratum before them they need not stick at little points of traditional musical etiquette.

#### THE REGULATION.

Accompanying the above decree, which was in Latin, there was also in the circular letter to the bishops of Italy a *Regolamento* (regulation) concerning the style and execution of music at litur-

<sup>1</sup> Trans in *Echo*, vol. i., No. 12.

gical functions and at extra-liturgical ceremonies and devotions, concerning the use of the organ, and concerning the promotion of the study of ecclesiastical music and the removal of abuses. This regulation was in Italian. Its formal scope included only the dioceses of Italy; but while it contemplates a status of music peculiar in some respects to that country, nevertheless its provisions should be considered a valuable indication of the attitude of the Holy See towards church music in general. That such is, indeed, the common interpretation of the document is evidenced by the wide interest it has excited. If this interest should promote the adoption, by all the choir-masters in our own land, of what we may choose to consider its suggestions, rather than its rules, a large gain could not fail to accrue to the cause of sacred music.

The decree has been styled "tolerant"—perhaps it would have been better to call it prudently practical. It will not tolerate anything which the circumstances of the people, the locality and the divine ceremonial would indicate to be against piety or propriety; it does not, even permissively, sanction indecorum in the music. But it does take into account the difficulties and perplexities of many a bishop and priest and choir-master in certain localities—difficulties and perplexities which are to be met with even in our own favored land, blessed though it generally be with abundance of financial means and with the absence of hampering immemorial traditions. Zeal is a mighty lever; but it will not move the world with a sudden force; it will not furnish scientifically competent organists and choir-masters to churches that cannot pay them enough salary; it cannot succeed in the creation of a spontaneous love for that which is commonly voted a bore; it cannot afford to disregard the world-wide fact of a difference in æsthetic appreciations. It should, indeed, "reach from end to end powerfully"; but it must "dispose all things sweetly." It must not insist on the immediate attainment of a presently unattainable ideal, nor encourage the weak to greater exertion through ridicule or castigation. A vast stride towards the popularizing of beauty is the demonstration of beauty. This course will, slowly, perhaps, but surely, have its proper effect in the culture of excellent standards, and with this gradual diffusion of an educated taste will grow also a desire for its legitimate satisfaction. But let not the zealous become a zealot—he will surely defeat his own end. We have seen it gravely stated by one such that Palestrina, the prince of church musicians, whose style has become the type for the most approved of sacred compositions and whose music is the *ultima Thule* of sacred polyphony, whose polyphonic chants the *Regolamento* considers "degnissima della casa di Dio" ("most worthy of the house of God")—even the divine Palestrina was

"one of the greatest destroyers of piety amongst the faithful"—not by his life (for he was a singularly pious and devout and humble child of the Church, and enjoyed the friendship and spiritual ministrations of St. Philip Neri) but by his music! "We think," says this critic, "that one would do well, despite the enthusiasm of certain choir-masters, to limit himself to having the music of Palestrina heard in the conservatories and in those reunions known by the singular name of *concerts spirituels*. This music may be religious in a general sense, but it is not Catholic. It will no more replace our introits, our *kyrie*, our *sanctus*, our responses in plain chant than a sweet *meditation* of Lamartine or a fine page of Chateaubriand will take the place of a sermon." This is the spirit which gives us the modern cult of the lifeless and rigid forms of the pre-Raphaelites. Indeed, our critic puts Raphael—him of the modest brush—together with Palestrina in the same sweeping denunciation, "Raphaël, Palestrina, ont été les grands destructeurs de la piété chez les fidèles."

The *Regolamento* is a witness to the zeal of the Church for the proprieties of ceremonial liturgy. But its freedom from the *minutiae* of very specific directions concerning music and musicians has, we understand, subjected it to the criticism that its enunciation of general truths is but a "beating of the air." The criticism is, in view of the history of recent legislation in sacred music, really a confession. It is a confession of the unwisdom of extreme paternalism. Again is the necessity of a practical zeal demonstrated!—a zeal which does not expend itself in an impossible multiplicity of legal detail nor place on the backs of men an unbearable burden. What has been the experience of the Holy See in this very matter?

Some ten years ago the Congregation of Rites issued, with the full approval of the Pope, a similar series of rules, "to remedy effectually the grave abuses which have crept into the sacred music performed in the various churches in Italy." They were very far from indulging in that stringent and impracticable detail of which we have been speaking, and were generally regarded by the "moderate" school of music-lovers as a triumphant refutation of extremism. Yet even this "tolerant" regulation was found to be unsuited to the circumstances of certain localities in Italy. The present *Regolamento* is, accordingly, meant to temper the moderate detail of the former: "Although the regulation in regard to church music, issued to the Italian Episcopate by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on September 24, 1884, by Papal authority, contained," says the recent Circular Letter enclosing the *Regolamento*, "many instructive rules for that important part of the liturgy of the Church, the difficulties as regards their exact observance which



have occurred in a large number of dioceses are not a few, nor are they inconsiderable.

"In order to remove these obstacles and to insure that the music in every church may be worthy of the House of God, the Holy Father, having caused the principal masters of the art of music to be consulted, and the opinions of several bishops in various parts of Italy to be ascertained, arranged that the Congregation of Rites itself, in full session, should take this important matter into consideration and indicate what needs clearer explanation or alteration in the said rules, and what modifications should be made in order that the desired end may be more easily attained."<sup>1</sup>

The recent series of rules places, therefore, a desirable standard before us, points out what may be considered legitimate in church music, decries abuses, exhorts to increased zeal in the promotion of sacred music; but instead of loading itself down with impracticable legislative details, remains, for the most part, content with general directions.

The *Regolamento* consists of two parts; a series of twelve "General Regulations," and a series of four "Instructions to Promote the Study of Sacred Music and Remove Abuses."<sup>2</sup>

ARTICLE I.—Every musical composition harmonizing with the spirit of the accompanying sacred function, and religiously corresponding with the meaning of the rite and the liturgical words moves the faithful to devotion, and is therefore worthy of the House of God.

ARTICLE II.—Such is the Gregorian chant which the Church regards as truly her own, and which is accordingly the only one adopted in the liturgical books of which she approves.

ARTICLE III.—The polyphonic chant, as also the chromatic chant, rendered in the style above indicated, may likewise be suited to public functions.

ARTICLE IV.—In the polyphonic style the music of Pier-Luigi da Palestrina, and of his faithful imitators, is recognized as most worthy of the House of God; as regards chromatic music, that which has been transmitted to us down to the present day by recognized masters (*accreditati Maestri*) of the various Italian and foreign schools, and particularly of Roman masters (*Maestri Romani*), whose compositions have often been much praised by competent authority as truly religious (*veramente sacre*), is also worthy of divine worship.

A large principle is enunciated in Article I. Those who are

<sup>1</sup> The London *Tablet*, August 25, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> For the translation of this regulation, and of that of 1884, we are indebted to the London *Tablet*.

familiar with the controversies of the last few years concerning the kind of music which should be deemed suitable for divine service, will immediately appreciate its largeness. The Church does not insist on the use of plain chant at all of her liturgical ceremonies. Indeed, she never has done so in the past. Neither does she only "tolerate" figured music. On the contrary, an honored place is given to it by this official pronouncement, as well as by the testimony of her past history, and the present approved practice in the very seat of her dominion. Recognition is given to the most patent of all facts in æsthetics, that there may be several types, and therefore several standards of beauty. Customs, traditions, personal predilections, the temperament—all these are elements in the fashioning both of types of the beautiful and of a correct appreciation of those types as models for imitation. Those who insist on a single type of music for divine service, reason too often on *a priori* grounds, as though man were made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man. And unfortunately these *a priori* grounds are in reality sometimes merely geographical, and sometimes merely temperamental. The Church, on the other hand, is catholic; and so she cannot afford to impose on all her children the tastes of one locality or the predilections of one class of physical temperament. The endeavor to do so would involve her in endless perplexities. She has surely a large enough mission before her in her divine task of engrafting the supernatural upon the natural, without embarrassing her efforts by the impossible attempt to radically change the natural.

To give an illustration: The poles of musical appreciation are to be found in what are popularly called the German and Italian styles. Generally speaking, the one may be called harmonic, the other melodic—the one grave, majestic, calm; the other light-hearted, merry, enthusiastic. The one is a deep-flowing river, which bears in its broad bosom the songs of many tributary streams; the other is a brook, singing, not a deep but a loud chant; not a many-toned anthem, but a single lay. If the writer might intrude in this place his own predilection, he would unhesitatingly choose the former. But he knows that diversity of temperament seeks diversity of ministration. He remembers that to the large-hearted and tender-souled old Doctor Johnson all music was but a *noise*—although "the least disagreeable of noises"; that Hudibras was but a type of them for whom

"Discords make the sweetest airs";

that, with Jessica, some are "never merry" when they "hear sweet music"; that for others, music but

"— brings sweet sleep down from the blissful skies."

He can therefore understand the following remarks of a magazine published in Italy,<sup>1</sup> in an article treating of this *Regolamento*:

"One of the most illustrious men of Germany, skilled in sacred music, was several times present in the churches in Rome during the singing of the litany of the Blessed Virgin. He found fault with it, as though its melody were wholly unfit for fostering piety. He said it was like the songs which the street-sweepers, or such scurvy representatives of the lowest class, sing in the highways, commonly called *tarantella*. Nevertheless, throughout all Italy, you will scarce find another style of song which is more suited either for fostering devotion to our common Mother in Heaven, or for lifting the heart to God in a more salutary fashion. But now, on the other hand, a certain very illustrious representative of the Roman Church, after hearing this censure *usque ad nauseam*, went to Germany, and listened often to the melody of the same Litany in use there, than which there is, in the opinion of all the inhabitants, nothing fitter for exciting pious feelings of devotion. He considered the music not unlike that which Italians call a *ninna-nanna* (lullaby), and especially the prolix and endless *bitte für uns*. Which of these two had the better reason on his side? Neither, we say. The Italian Litanies are the best and most devotional—but for Italians; in the same way, the German Litanies are the best and most devotional—but for Germans. Transfer the Italian Litany to Germany, or the German Litany to Italy, and you will experience the reverse. The melody is the same, but the character of the people is different, and therefore opposite effects are produced. How, then, should different peoples be nourished by the same food when they possess different kinds of stomachs? What is appetizing and nourishing to some, serves but to disgust others, so that they remain without food and grow weaker. Would that the reformers understood this and held their peace."

This apology for Italian tastes in sacred music reminds us that every nationality has more or less characteristic likes and dislikes. Both of the typical characters quoted above in opposition to each other would probably agree in a common scorn of the ordinary tastes of Americans. Certainly, if the songs of the people be an indication of their musical taste, we have very little to congratulate ourselves upon—neither the gravity of the German folk-songs nor the light-hearted melodiousness of the Italian *canzoni popolari*. And so the apology which the Italian makes in the matter of music finds a greater scope in our own case. But the grand principle behind all the national tastes is that they are expressions of the popular genius. If music has a mission appealing to men's emo-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ephemer. Liturg.*, September, 1894.

tions and sympathies, it must adapt itself to those sympathies rather than run counter to them. This view has the suffrages of saints as well as philosophers. St. Charles Borromeo was a foremost figure amongst those who pleaded and labored for the retention of figured music in the churches at a time when the abuses introduced by that very music were incomparably more flagrant than they are to-day: and when a zealous spirit of reform, sweeping like a tidal-wave over Catholic Europe, seemed desirous of leaving in its path only the most enduring landmarks of ancient traditions, St. Philip Neri, the prudent ascetic of the same era, the wise reader of the signs of those times, took advantage of the new music to win young men to the services held in his oratory. His sermons and instructions were interspersed with popular hymns—*Laudi Spirituali*—and with acts of sacred musical dramas, subsequently called, from the place of their performance, oratorios. These services became thus so popular that three volumes of *Laudi* were published by his Maestro di Capella, the saintly Animuccia. Little wonder that St. Philip should have been thought able to drive his penitents to heaven in a coach-and-four!

Doubtless there are limits to be considered in this condescension to popular tastes. On the one hand, the rubrics and liturgical proprieties must be observed; and, on the other, the tastes of the people may be quickened to an appreciation of better art. But after the many attempts at a unique style of church music have been compelled to confess as many failures, it would seem to be a wise course for musical reformers to seek the amelioration, rather than the abolition, of existing styles of sacred song.

It will be noticed that the *Regolamento* proudly places the Roman, Gregorian chant, first in the list of that kind of music which is worthy of the House of God. It should be unnecessary to speak at length of a subject around which has grown up such a large and appreciative literature. It has been discussed from all points of view—liturgical, devotional, musical, practical, æsthetic (and what has been illogically and unjustly confounded therewith), sentimental. The indefatigable presses have developed volumes; the quarterlies, reviews; the magazines, articles; the newspapers, paragraphs; the social company, loquacity, on this venerable and majestic theme. But this last phrase reminds the writer that he is taking sides in a discussion which is not all laudatory. For there be those who, in the sincerity of a holy zeal, would suggest the immediate rejection from the divine service of all music but plain chant; and those who, in the sincerity of a prudent zeal, counsel a temporizing policy, *meliora sperantes*, until such time as the gradual rehabilitation of the ancient Song in the Courts of the Lord shall have sufficiently educated head and heart to an appre-

ciation of and a consequent longing for it; and others who, in the sincerity of a liberal view, would have a complete fraternization of both ancient and modern song in the Church; and, last of all, there be those who, in the sincerity of a profound ignorance, find in Gregorian chant only a crude relic of barbarous ages, an unscientific germ of a great science, an unmusical groping after music, an unrhythmical foreshadowing of the limpid forms and liquid measures of Haydn and Mozart—in a word, a “child” which, in a sense as unworthy as it is un-Wordsworthian, “is father to the man.”

In the first and the last of these classes extremes meet. We have already heard the lament of that critic who considered Palestrina “one of the greatest destroyers of piety amongst the faithful”; and if some of our readers will take the trouble to measure their own sentiment in the matter, perhaps they shall not be compelled to go far in search of the other extreme. A word in this place concerning the chant may not, therefore, be amiss.

First of all, judgment should not be passed on a caricature. The chant, as often heard, is indeed “plain”—a veritable parody. Some weight must be allowed to the educated and cultured taste of those musicians of all schools of music and all shades of religious belief and unbelief, who—to select typical names—like Gounod, Wagner, Mendelssohn, Rousseau, have found it proper to praise plain chant in very characteristic and highly eulogistic fashion. They were so fortunate as to hear it fairly executed, or so expert as to read in its printed pages the secret of its beauty.

Secondly, it is wholly unlike modern music. It is rhythmical, but not mathematically so, as modern music is. It has (practically) eight different modes, each possessing, like our two modern major and minor modes, a different character which those accustomed to it for a long time perceive as acutely as we do the characteristic tonalities of our two modern modes. It is therefore richer in one respect than modern music.

Thirdly, it is intended to be a mere drapery clothing the majestic forms of the liturgical texts. Unlike modern music, it is to be, not the master, but the slave, of the text. It receives its accent, not from a measured beat, but from the various accents of prosody, of meaning, of devotion, and sentiment. The singer must be informed by the spirit of the texts, and his own sentiment must then inform the melody.

Such is a very brief summary of the theory; the facts are generally of a very different nature. If uncultivated voices and unsympathetic natures do but mock the fine ecstasy of the greatest modern composers; if they make that unrhythmic which is instinct

with the rhythm of a poetic soul, that hard and crude which vibrates with sentiment, that grandiose which is simple, that dramatic which is lyric (and *vice versa*)—in short, if they sing without knowing how, and disfigure utterly a noble musical creation: so, also, the harsh voice, untrained ear, uncultured heart, may easily succeed in parodying a chant which must essentially depend for its best beauty on the singer rather than the song. In modern music a knowledge of the text is not very essential to an interpretation of the melody; in plain chant it is uniquely and wholly so, for its rhythm and poetry and expression are the rhythm and poetry and expression by which a good reader presents the thought of a harmonious writer.

Again, our whole modern education in music; the universal prevalence of the modern as opposed to the mediæval modes; the tastes formed in us by this constant familiarity with but one kind of musical expression—this condition is surely unfavorable to a just appreciation of Gregorian chant. It is almost as though we should be called upon to relish the intricate and baffling tonalities of the Hindu, with his seventy-two modes and restrictive *ragas* regulating the succession of tones in a melody; or of the Persian, with his subdivision of the semitone into the limma and comma of Pythagoras; or of the Chinese, with his marvelously antique musical system founded on the celestial symbolism of numbers. And so the strange passes for the uncouth, and the unintelligible for the unscientific. Plain chant is, however, neither barbarous nor inartistic—it just happens to be mediæval and obtrusively scientific. What the future of chant will be in America—outside of the question of the *accentus* of the sacred ministers at the altar, a question which is definitely settled by enduring rubrics—we shall scarce venture to surmise. Our own land has not the centuried traditions which would serve so well as a foundation for a grand mediæval cathedral of song.

The regulation next praises the Palestrinesque style. A proper rendition of such a style must pre-suppose a good technical training in it. It can be executed by any good choir only in the same sense that Chopin can be played by any good pianist. Just as a proper interpretation of the music of Chopin requires, however, a distinct technical and æsthetic training for that one style of composition, so a good execution of Palestrina's masterpieces will require a knowledge of that traditional method of rendition which no mere study of a manuscript can furnish. A taste for the *a capella* style of the sixteenth century will scarce be a plant of quick growth here. The ecclesiastical modes used by that school will sound strange to ears accustomed to only the two modern scales, major and minor; and the gravity of progression and

formal style of counterpoint—pleasant as a change from the vivacity and freedom of modern melody and harmony—may easily pall on the taste, despite all the delicate surprises of chords and quaint progression of the parts and fine shadings of expression. Great praise is due to the Society of St. Cecilia for the cultivation and exposition of this style in America, as in Europe, and for the large repertory it has furnished to choir-masters. By voice and pen alike it has ably preached the excellences of both the style of Palestrina and his school and the present-day approach to it—we say approach, as the modern composers generally prefer, for obvious reasons, to follow his style in the modern tonalities.

The regulation speaks next of “chromatic music.” The great compositions of the great masters, Italian and extra-Italian, are considered “worthy of divine worship.” To give anything like a full account of the discussions raised on this subject would require a separate article. Briefly, it may be said that the compositions of the so-called Viennese school—Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven—and of the modern Italian schools have attracted special obloquy. But they have had brilliant apologists and have apparently suffered but slightly in popular favor and in frequency of performance. Their length, frequent repetitions of words, un-liturgical commencements (*e.g.*, in the words *Gloria in excelsis Deo* and *Credo in unum Deum*, which the rubrics confine to the celebrant), their operatic or quasi-operatic divisions into solo, duet, trio, chorus, etc., their occasional omissions and transpositions of words, their dramatic tone-painting, their brilliant scale-passages and *bravura* runs, their sensuous beauty—all these peculiarities which so forcibly differentiate them from the elder polyphonic chants, have served as so many heads of discourse, chapters of denunciation, shining targets for the shafts of ridicule. The discussion has been rarely temperate, and, therefore, rarely just.

The facts may perhaps be fairly stated as follows: Speaking generally, the compositions under discussion aimed at a quasi-dramatic exposition of the texts. The lawfulness or propriety of such a proceeding may be a matter for discussion; but, to the present writer, it seems to have exceedingly weighty arguments, which we need not enter into here, in its favor. Again, occasional textual omissions occur in some—not by any means in all—of these compositions. It is indeed a matter to be regretted, but it hardly seems necessary to condemn a whole masterpiece for one or two flaws, provided that such flaws be removable. And it has been said that in the works of the great masters there are very few such flaws which a competent choir-master cannot remove by careful manipulation of the musical texture. Again, repetitions of words occur, sometimes frequently, sometimes only very rarely.

The principle that no repetitions should be allowed would exclude every composition except plain chant, for all the schools of sacred music have used repetition—indeed could scarce avoid its use in the artistic development of a musical inspiration. The question of propriety immediately arises, and must determine the limits of repetition. In this connection, Article X. is worthy of quotation: "To safeguard the respect due to the words of the Liturgy, and prevent the ceremony becoming too long, every piece in which words are found to be omitted, deprived of their meaning, or indiscreetly repeated, is forbidden." To repeat is not then forbidden—but discretion must be used by composers. The Regulation of 1884 reads: "All music is forbidden in which the words of the sacred text are omitted, even to the smallest extent, or transposed, cut up, too often repeated, or only intelligible with difficulty." The expressions "too often repeated" and "indiscreetly repeated" are general, and suppose the watchful judgment of the ordinary, or parish priest, to define the limits. With respect to another charge against these compositions, namely, that their division into solos, trios, etc., suggests the theatre and concert-hall, it might be said that while in certain of the poorer masses—those composed by men of mediocre fame—the very frequent use of such "numbers" might suggest a poor opera of a former vogue, the works of the masters are very far from such suggestiveness. They are rather similar to a finely conceived oratorio—religious and inspiring. But the expression, "concert-hall," possessing one meaning in European phraseology, approaches in our own land to the viler uses of the word "saloon" in recent prohibition literature. It seems meant to convey rather vituperation than conviction, a sneer rather than an argument. Without entering further into a discussion of the propriety of such occasional divisions of the musical texture, it suffices to know that after all the battles waged against it, the Church has for it a word, not of condemnation, but only of caution. "It is forbidden," says Article XI., "to break up into pieces, completely detached, the versicles which are necessarily interconnected." The Regulation of 1884 entered more into detail: "Solos, duetts, and trios are permitted, provided they have the character of sacred music, and are part of the consecutive whole of the composition." The divisions are therefore permitted, but they must not be "completely detached" when they respect versicles which are "necessarily interconnected." Concerning the length of the "Masses," it may be noted that the custom in European churches is to have the Solemn Mass much earlier than in America, so that the liturgical limit of noon gives a large scope to the composer.

Finally, with regard to the "theatrical" character of such music,



it may be said that "tastes differ," and judgments also. Some church-music is cast in that line, but not the works of the great composers. The theatrical style of the German seems heavy and sombre and funereal to the Italian; that of the Italian is not sufficiently vivacious for the Frenchman; just as an Italian critic assures us that the religious music which is best suited for the French, the Italians judge to be light and puerile; and on the other hand, that which is religious to the Italians will sometimes cause wonder, if not scandal, to the French. The vague discussion which thus goes on in matters of taste is brought down to a practical working plane by Article IX.: "All profane music, particularly if it savors of theatrical motives, variations, and reminiscences, is absolutely forbidden." "Profane" music is that which is not "sacred" music. Perhaps we may understand this distinction better by recalling to mind the prohibition in the Regulation of 1884: "All kinds of vocal music composed upon *theatrical or profane themes or selections, are expressly forbidden in church*, as well as music of too light or too sensuous a style, such as *gaballette* or *cavalette*, or recitations of a theatrical nature." To select profane themes for the sacred texts was the musical and liturgical sin freely committed in the days of Palestrina, and it deservedly met with a rebuke that imperilled all figured music in the churches. We do not recollect having heard any such used by the great composers. With regard to the *cavalette* style, our American ears would not tolerate it for a moment in the Church, and we can recollect but one good Mass in which there occurs a "theatrical recitative."

But, while the composition itself may not be theatrical in character, the choir, too often, alas! is very much so. It is a subject for special ordinances, and as it is a painful one, and not immediately concerned with our present purpose, we shall dismiss it with the remark that to it should be referred most of the present devotional discontent with sacred music and the general feeling that some reforms should be speedily undertaken.

The remaining articles in the first section of the regulation are as follows:

ARTICLE V.—As a polyphonic musical composition, however perfect it may be, may, through faulty execution, appear unsuitable, it ought to be replaced by the Gregorian chant in strictly liturgical functions every time one is not certain of a successful rendering.

ARTICLE VI.—Figured organ music ought generally to be in accord with the grave, harmonious and sustained character of that instrument. The instrumental accompaniment ought to decorously support and not drown the chant. In the preludes and in-

terludes the organ, as well as the other instruments, ought always to preserve the sacred character corresponding to the sentiment of the function.

ARTICLE VII.—In strictly liturgical functions one ought to use the language proper to the rite, and the selected pieces ought to be taken from the Sacred Scriptures, from the Breviary or hymns and prayers approved by the Church.

ARTICLE VIII.—In any other ceremony one may use the vulgar tongue, selecting the words of devout and approved compositions.

ARTICLE XII.—It is forbidden to improvise fantasias upon the organ by any one who is not capable of doing it in a suitable manner—that is, in a way conformable not only to the rules of art but also calculated to inspire piety and recollectedness among the faithful.

Article V. has, unfortunately, no application to *our* needs. With us it would be still more difficult to render a plain chant Mass well than almost any figured chant. But a suggestion might be made, *apropos* of this, that wherever and whenever a choir is unable to produce properly a “grand” Mass it should respect the fame of the composer, the real merits of his work, the feelings of the congregation, and especially the liturgical proprieties, by contenting itself with a simpler composition.

Article VI., like Article XII., explains itself—would that many an organist might as clearly explain himself!

The provisions in Articles VII. and VIII. have respect to the liturgical use of the Latin tongue. Concerning the services we have generally here, the limits for the exclusive use of Latin are the High Mass, Vespers and Benediction (as soon as the *Tantum Ergo* has been commenced).

To understand the significance of the second section of the *Regolamento* it will be necessary to recall the older provisions abrogated by it. It seems a great pity that the circumstances of the dioceses in Italy did not permit these elder rules to continue. For many of the dioceses in this country they would seem to offer an excellent, and especially a very feasible, means for reforming abuses in sacred music. For this double reason they are here given (Artt. XV.–XXII.), followed by the recent abrogation of them.

Articles XV. and XVI. relate to the choice of books, etc., in which matter full liberty is left to the ordinaries, apart from the recommendations of the Sacred Congregation.

ARTICLE XVII.—Besides the published repertory of sacred music, the use is also permitted of manuscript music, such as is preserved in various churches, chapels and other ecclesiastical institutions, provided the choice is made by a special commission, under the title of St. Cecilia, which shall be founded in every

diocese, having at its head the diocesan inspector of sacred music, under the immediate control of the ordinaries.

ARTICLE XVIII.—The performance of pieces only, published or unpublished, will be allowed in church which are catalogued in the *Diocesan Index of Repertories* and which bear the countersign, stamp and *visa* of the *Commission of St. Cecilia* and of its inspector-president, who, in union with the Commission and always under the immediate jurisdiction of the Ordinary, without prejudice to the authority of local superiors, may even supervise the performance on the spot, request to inspect the music already or about to be performed and examine into the matter of their compliance with the regulations and with the papers authenticated by the countersign, stamp and *visa*. He may also report to the ordinary and obtain the application of energetic measures against those who transgress.

ARTICLE XIX.—Organists and choir-masters will devote all their efforts and their talent to the best possible execution of the music catalogued in that repertory. They may also employ their science to the enriching it with new compositions, provided these are in conformity with the aforesaid regulations, which are binding on every one. Even the members of the commission itself shall be subject to the reciprocal revision of their works.

ARTICLE XX.—To all missionary rectors and parish priests is entrusted the execution of the repertory in the *Diocesan Index*, compiled by the Commission of St. Cecilia and approved by the Ordinary, under pain of reprimand in case of transgression. This *Repertory Index* may afterwards have new compositions added to it.

ARTICLE XXI.—The said commissions shall be composed of ecclesiastics and of laymen, experts in music, and animated by a profoundly Catholic spirit. The nomination and appointment of all the members belong of right to the Ordinaries of dioceses.

#### FOR THE FUTURE IMPROVEMENT OF SACRED MUSIC SCHOOLS.

ARTICLE XXII.—To prepare a better future for sacred music in Italy, it is desirable that the ordinaries should be able to found schools for teaching figured music on the most perfect and authorized methods, or to improve those already existing in their sacred institutions, especially in the seminaries. To this end it would be advisable to open special schools for sacred music in the principal centres of the peninsula in order to train up good singers, organists and choir-masters, as has already been done in Milan.

These regulations contemplated the establishment in every diocese of a musical committee, consisting of ecclesiastics and laymen, "experts in music and animated by a profoundly Catholic

spirit," who should be appointed by the ordinary. This body of lay and clerical experts was to compile for its diocese an *Index of Repertories*. This repertory should be exclusive, so that no piece of music, published or unpublished, could be performed in church which should not meet its sanction. A diocesan musical inspector should be vested with the large powers of inspection indicated in Article XVIII. Energetic measures should be taken by the Ordinary against transgressors of the regulations. Again, bishops were counselled to found and improve special schools for the study of ecclesiastical music, and such study should be especially cultivated in the diocesan seminaries.

This scheme was evidently meant as a constant provision for reducing all of the *Regolamento* to practical measures. Although it failed signally, as the portion we are about to quote from the recent *Regolamento* shows, it might prove feasible in our own land, blessed with greater abundance of financial help, and quite free from fixed traditions in musical taste. But the repertory should be elastic enough to cover all needs, those of isolated and poorer communities as well as those of flourishing parishes; and the principal stress should, it seems to us, be laid rather on an edifying and capable execution of sacred music than on a specific determination of what that music should be in its style of composition. It has been our aim in this paper, as indeed it is plainly the aim of the *Regolamento*, to avoid æsthetic considerations, and to limit the reform movement to lines laid down by the rubrics and by the most common appreciation of the eternal fitness of things. Common sense is to be cultivated rather than scholastic tastes. It is not the character of the music performed so much as the frivolous vanities and irreverent vexations of organist and singers, generally more vain and vexatious as they are more incompetent, that should invite constant reproof. It is the heart service, and not the lip service, that God is pleased with. Whether it be Palestrina, or Haydn, or Cherubini, or Aldega, or the Mustafas and Capoccis of to-day, provided they write Masses within the lines of liturgical directions and a large sense of propriety, their music is not unfit for divine service amongst the various peoples by whom these various styles are respectively admired. It was a favorite thing amongst the lovers of the antique music to fling at Haydn's church compositions the sneer of Mendelssohn, that it was "scandalously gay." But tastes differ. What Mendelssohn thought gay even to scandal, the ordinary taste of our people considers classically dignified; while to the Italians it approaches the funereal. Hear one of them on this subject: "In the music of Mozart, *ex. gr.*, Haydn, Beethoven, we do not deny the merit of art, although many of their compositions are of such a character as very often to fatigue Italians, and, as it

were, invite to sleep!" He is speaking of the church music of these masters. Taste is, then, a matter of such universal variety, and of such immemorial privilege, that there is not a language in which its proverb does not exist—"every man to his taste." Men speak different tongues, but God hears one language; they praise Him in diverse music, but He hears one harmony. The lover of one style of church music shall fruitlessly dream of removing discordant schools. May he not console himself with the gracious words of Lowell?

"My dream is shattered; yet who knows  
But in that heaven so near,  
These discords find harmonious close  
In God's atoning ear!"

The second part of the *Regolamento*, abrogating the elder specific directions which we have just been considering, is as follows:

"INSTRUCTIONS TO PROMOTE THE STUDY OF SACRED MUSIC  
AND REFORM ABUSES.

"I.—Since sacred music forms part of the Liturgy, bishops are recommended to be specially careful of it, and to make it the subject of ordinances, particularly in diocesan and provincial synods, always in conformity with the present regulations. The co-operation of the laity is permitted, but under the supervision of the bishops. It is forbidden to form committees and hold congresses without the express consent of ecclesiastical authority, which, for the diocese, is the bishop, and for the province the metropolitan, with his suffragans. It is also forbidden to publish periodicals dealing with church music without the *imprimatur* of the ordinary. All discussion of the articles of the present regulations is absolutely interdicted. As to what concerns sacred music, discussion is permissible provided the laws of charity are observed, and that no one constitutes himself master and judge of others.

"II.—Bishops should impose upon clerics the obligation of studying plain chant, particularly as it is found in books approved by the Holy See. As to other kinds of music and the study of the organ, it will not be obligatory, so as not to distract them from the more serious studies to which they should apply themselves: but if there should be found among them those who are already versed in this kind of study, or who have particular aptitudes for it, they may be permitted to perfect themselves therein.

"III.—Let the bishops exercise supervision over parish priests and rectors of churches, so that they may not permit music contrary to the instructions of the present regulations, having recourse, if need be, to canonical penalties against delinquents.

"IV.—The publication of the present regulations, and the communication thereof made to the bishops of Italy, abrogates all previous regulations on the same subject."

We have presented the complete *Regolamento*, as approved in all its parts by the Holy Father, and by him ordered to be published. The word is to be final. All discussion of the regulations is forbidden; and all publications and "congresses," which are the fruitful parents of controversy, are to be regarded with the jealous and vigilant supervision of ecclesiastical authority.

Comment on this second section of the *Regolamento* is hardly needed. But we shall content ourselves with one of its directions as a concluding thought: "As to what concerns sacred music, discussion is permissible provided the laws of charity are observed, and provided that no one constitutes himself master and judge of others." This declaration looks to charity and peace, but is, as it cannot help being, reminiscent of discord and strife. Why the soothing subject of music should have been, like the soil in which the Dragon-teeth were sown, pregnant of a crop of warring giants, can perhaps be explained only by the fact that musicians are an "irritable tribe," like the *irritabile genus vatium* of Horace. It seems a very harsh implication which is contained in the remark of the Regulation that *no one should constitute himself master and judge of others*. But the Regulation desires to be a final one, and asserts finally that the supreme censorship of sacred music is vested, not in any sacred musical school, or any scholar, but alone in the Church—that Church which, throughout the long ages, has so patiently and so tenderly acted out the golden words of one of her greatest Doctors: "IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS: IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS: IN OMNIBUS CARITAS."

H. T. HENRY.

ST. CHARLES SEMINARY, OVERBROOK.



## THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATION.

THE subject which we undertake to treat in this article is of the highest importance, whether it be regarded from the theological and canonical point of view or from that of international law. Both in its historical aspects and in its actual bearings it is full of an interest which we by no means underrate. We realize that delicate questions are involved, and, accordingly, we shall handle them with the care which they demand. Confining ourselves strictly to the scientific treatment of our subject, we shall establish principles and deduce conclusions. With politics we have nothing to do.

There are two official documents bearing on this matter which must be constantly kept in view. The first is the famous Response of Pius VI. concerning Nunciatures (Nov. 14, 1789). Cardinal Garampi and Francesco Antonio Zaccaria prepared the materials, while the work of putting them into proper shape devolved upon Cardinal Campanelli and the consistorial advocate Smith. The other document is the letter written April 15, 1885, by Cardinal Jacobini to the Nuncio at Madrid, Cardinal Rampolla. There are, moreover, various sources of information upon which we shall draw according as we present different aspects of the subject. Such, for the theologico-canonical treatment, are the principal Commentators on the Decretals<sup>1</sup> and certain modern writers.<sup>2</sup> As affected by international law our subject is handled, though not completely, in "La papauté en droit internationale," by Imbart Latour, while its historico-juridical aspect is discussed by Pierre de Marca<sup>3</sup> and by Audisio.<sup>4</sup> The latter claims that his work sets forth whatever is solid and useful in the Response of Pius VI., and contains, moreover, a critical review of De Marca's book. Finally, we shall not omit an examination of the opposite position as represented by Marco Antonio De Dominis, Richer, Febronius, Eybel, and, on somewhat different grounds, by Bluntschli, Geffcken, and Wyss. Those of our readers who may desire a more detailed bibliography will find it in the large collection of Roskovany.<sup>5</sup> As it is our intention to write, not a treatise but an article, we shall

<sup>1</sup> De Officio Legati, Lib. I., tit. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Zaccaria, *Antifebronius Vindicatus*, Diss. 6; Roskovany, *De Primatu Romani Pontificis Ejusque Juribus*, par. 106; Bouix, *De Curia Romana*, part 4, s. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *De Concordia Sacerdotii et imperii* lib. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Idea storica e razionale della diplomazia ecclesiastica*.

<sup>5</sup> *Romanus Pontifex tanquam Primas Ecclesie et Princeps Civilis*.

touch only the main points of our subject, dealing first with delegations in general and then with the American delegation.

#### I.—LEGATIONS IN GENERAL.

Every sovereign power is bound to preserve order within its borders and to maintain peaceful relations abroad. Similarly, there devolves upon the spiritual supremacy the two-fold duty of upholding discipline in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and of so managing its relations with civil authority as to insure the accord of Church and State. In the performance of this duty the Sovereign Pontiff, ruling the Church from its centre, is aided by representatives of his person and authority who are in a measure the eyes with which he sees, the mind with which he thinks, and the tongue wherewith he speaks. To these he intrusts, at times, a particular mission and at other times a general mission. In some cases their charge is temporary, in others it is permanent.

Various names have been given in the course of centuries to such representatives of the Holy See. Thus, they have been called *apocrisarii* or *responsales*, because they communicate the decisions and decrees (ἀποκρισις, *responsum*) of the Pontiff; *vicarii*, inasmuch as they take his place; *legati*, *delegati*, as acting in his name; *missi*, *nuntii*, *internuntii*, that is, his envoys or messengers. From these titles are derived such combinations as "Internuncio Extraordinary and Apostolic Delegate," "Apostolic Internuncio and Extraordinary Envoy," and the like. We need not at present enter into details of this nature. Suffice it to say that such appellations are not purely ecclesiastical in their origin; they are borrowed rather from the administrative language of imperial Rome, in which analogous offices were established and similar functions exercised. A word, however, may be added concerning the qualification "Apostolic." This term is always reserved for the Roman See, whose incumbent is styled *Dominus Apostolicus*, not only because Rome is the centre of jurisdiction but also because it is the living source whence the light, the strength, and the Christ-kindled fire of the Apostolate must radiate to all the ends of the earth.

Legates, nuncios, and envoys are occupied in what is called "ecclesiastical diplomacy." And in this connection we may remark that *diplomacy* is derived from the Greek διπλωμα, which signifies *duplex* or double, and, consequently, something twice written. The term was applied to official and public documents of which the original was retained. The scribe who drew up the copy was known, according to Ducange's account, as *diplomatarius* or *duplicator*. Hence "diplomatist" in the beginning was used to designate a copyist or a custodian of copies. Later on, as the



form of such documents varied with the course of time, the same title was given to the person who showed his ability to understand and interpret them with the help of learning and critical acumen. Finally, at a more recent epoch, "diplomacy" came to be used in a higher sense, being transferred from the mere study of official papers to the science and art of negotiations and treaties. "Strange vicissitudes of a word! The modest term which once denoted the art of tracing or deciphering public documents has taken its place in assemblages that represent the majesty, the rights, and the interests of nations. It is applied even to those who represent the dignity of the Sovereign Ruler of Christians, the discipline and the interests of the Universal Church."<sup>1</sup>

### *Legations to Particular Churches.*

The sending of apostolic delegates to particular churches results naturally from the constitution of the Church Catholic and from the prerogatives of the Holy See. The history of such delegations is in a certain sense the history of the Church. The opponents of the one have been the enemies of the other.

The Church, in the language of Holy Writ, is an edifice of which Christ is the corner-stone; a kingdom whereof Christ is King; a fold of which Christ is the Shepherd; a living organism, a moral body, having Christ for its Head. Now Christ appointed as His vicar the Apostle Peter, and through him the Roman Pontiff, Peter's successor. Peter it is, therefore, upon whom the edifice rests, and to whom are given the keys of the kingdom. It is Peter who must feed the lambs and sheep of the flock, and who must confirm his brethren.

By the institution therefore of Christ Himself, the successor of Peter possesses supreme authority over the whole Church. This fundamental principle of Catholicism, defined but lately in the Vatican Council, was solemnly recognized by the East and the West in the Council of Florence, and, before that, in the second Council of Lyons, in 1274. Nowhere was it proclaimed more frequently or more energetically than in the proud cities of Antioch and Constantinople and in the words of St. John Chrysostom. In a hundred texts of this illustrious Father we find the affirmation that Christ has invested Peter with jurisdiction over the entire Church—*τὴν ἐπιστάσιαν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας ἐνεχείρισε.*

Peter's jurisdiction over the Universal Church is *plenary*, extending without restriction to everything that involves spiritual interests, to whatsoever can be bound or loosed in the kingdom established by Christ. It is a truly *episcopal* jurisdiction, implying

---

<sup>1</sup> Audisio, *op. cit.*, c. I.

the power to feed, direct, and govern the flock. It is *ordinary*, that is, it is to be exercised not only under exceptional circumstances, but also in the regular course of ecclesiastical affairs. And it is *immediate*, affecting directly all the faithful without any need of reaching one class through another, so that to it each individual, no less than the collective body, is subject.

On the other hand, the Universal Church, far from excluding particular churches, supposes them and encloses them in her bosom. The Church of Rome is not the only church; she is the mother and mistress of churches. And these, though dependent upon the mother-church and though forming but portions of the Universal Church, are none the less real churches, possessing in themselves a complete spiritual life and differing greatly from mere religious associations. Likewise, the bishop of Rome is not the only bishop; he is the bishop of bishops. About him are his brethren, whose jurisdiction flows from his, and who are subordinate to him. Nevertheless, they are princes and pastors in the true sense of the word; not simply delegates or prefects appointed by the Pontiff, and not merely superiors of religious congregations.

In each diocese, therefore, there are two episcopal authorities, that of the universal bishop and that of the local bishop. These jurisdictions in no way conflict. On the contrary, they are bound together in perfect harmony. The first is supreme, but does not absorb the other; the second, though subordinate, is yet efficacious and has its proper field of action. It is this truth that St. Leo so nobly expresses in his third sermon on the anniversary of his elevation: "*De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur qui et universarum gentium vocationi, et omnibus Apostolis cunctisque Ecclesiae patribus praeponatur; ut, quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus.*"<sup>1</sup>

Such, according to the Catholic idea, is the constitution of the Church. The Church of God is not only a school for the teaching of truth; it is, moreover, a perfect society. It is neither a republic nor a confederation; and if it can be called a monarchy, it is certainly far different from all other monarchies. It is a government without earthly parallel. It is, so to speak, a family in which the eldest son has been charged by the father with the general control of the household, while the management of certain details is committed to his younger brothers. Fraternity and authority which, in other systems, are separate, interlace in the government of the Church and present the most admirable union of vigor and gentleness; the one proceeding from the supreme power, the other resulting from a true fraternity which involves a certain equality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Migne, Pat. Lat., liv., 149, 150.

Now he who has been divinely intrusted with the permanent office of feeding, guiding and ruling, must of necessity have the right and the obligation of performing through others such duties as he cannot personally discharge. Not only must he intervene when the flock is already poisoned or perishing, when faith has been corrupted, and discipline thrown to the winds; he must ever be on the alert with watchful eye and outstretched hand, to direct by active measures every portion of the Church. But the eye and the arm of the Pontiff are his legates. Through them it is that he exercises sovereign control in far-lying regions of the globe. Says Innocent II. in his letter of October 2, 1137, appointing as his legate Adalberon, Archbishop of Treves: "Nec tantum vicinis verum etiam longe positis, ex injuncto nobis a Deo Apostolatus officio existimus debitores, utpote quibus Beati Petri vincula commissa, et omnium ecclesiarum quæ per mundi climata sitæ sunt, sollicitudo incumbit; quatenus ea quæ per locorum distantiam vel causarum multiplicitatem, per nostram præsentiam terminare non possumus, hæc eadem per Apostolicæ Sedis vicarios, auctore Domino, exequamur."<sup>1</sup>

There is one point in this matter which must be emphasized. The legates represent the person of the Sovereign Pontiff. They are sent to exercise his authority so far as it is communicated to them. They are not sent to lay hold upon the authority of bishops nor to lessen it. On the contrary, they are bound to sustain and defend episcopal power. Hence it is further to be remarked that their position is altogether different from that of secular ambassadors. The latter have no authority over the country to which they are sent. They are foreigners, just as the government which commissions them is foreign. But pontifical legates are not aliens. Wherever they are sent, they are on the territory of their sovereign, in whose name they act not merely by declaring his wishes and safeguarding his interests, but also by putting his decrees into execution. In a word they are more like the *legati provinciales* of imperial Rome, and the *missi dominici* of Charlemagne, than like ambassadors in the usual sense of the term.

The right of delegation being thus implied in the Primacy of the Pope, it is clear that any denial or restriction of the Primacy must challenge or limit that right. Say with Protestants and schismatics that the Pope has no authority over particular dioceses—that at most he enjoys but a primacy of honor: then, evidently, there can be no question of pontifical legates invested with jurisdiction. Declare with Richer, Febronius, De Dominis, Eybel and the members of the Congress of Ems, that the Pope has no ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in each diocese; then it is absurd to talk about *permanent* delegates. In fact, the Archbishop of Cologne, imbued with such false notions, wrote to Pius

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P. L., clxxix., 333.

VI., April 2, 1787. that he had fulfilled to the letter all his duties as a pastor in regard to the churches of which he had charge ; and hence inferred, first, that the Pope was not justified in extending to those churches the extraordinary rights of the Primacy ; secondly, that if the Pope had no right to send legates, the Archbishop was in no way obliged to receive them and permit the exercise of their powers to the detriment of his own ordinary authority over the flock divinely entrusted to his watchful care.<sup>1</sup> And if, finally, in the name of a narrow particularism, it be said, with the Gallicans, that the Pope is bound by the customs and the so-called *liberties* of nations, there can obviously be no question of legates, except with the permission of secular powers. Thus we read in the memoirs of the French clergy : " The Popes cannot send to France legates *a latere* unless at the request or with the consent of the king. Such legates cannot use their faculties until they have promised the king in writing and given their oath, that they will make only such use of these powers as will meet with the royal approbation."<sup>2</sup>

The institution of delegations is so intimately bound to the Primacy, flows from it so naturally, is so necessary to the life of the Church, that it has existed since the first centuries of Christianity under various names and forms. Leaving aside for the present the *Apocrisarii* and the *Responsales*, to whom we shall allude further on, let us name the vicars of Thessalonica, in Illyria ; of Arles and Vienne, in Gaul ; of Seville, in Spain ; of Mayence, in Germany ; of Canterbury, in England. The vicariate of Illyria must have dated from a very early period, since it is spoken of in the beginning of the fifth century as an ancient and solid institution. Innocent I., delegating the office of vicar to Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, in the year 412, affirms that in so doing he but follows the example of his predecessors, "*Prædecessores nostros apostolicos imitati.*"<sup>3</sup> St. Boniface I., in a letter to Rufus, 422, exhorts him to execute with zeal the duties imposed on the vicars apostolic who have preceded him,<sup>4</sup> and, in an address to the bishops of Thessaly, he deprecates " any attempt to modify what our predecessors have done and practised for so long," "*Nullus ea quæ sunt a patribus gesta et per tantum temporum custodita temerare contendat.*"<sup>5</sup> In the same sense speaks St. Sixtus III., 431,<sup>6</sup> and St. Leo, 444. " We appoint as our vicar," writes the latter, " our brother and co-bishop, Anastasius," following therein the example of those the memory of whom is in honor.<sup>7</sup> The vicariate of Arles, for antiquity, dignity and even extent, was not inferior to that of Thessalonica. The acts of the Popes Hilarus and Symmachus in regard to it are still extant.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pii VI., Resp., p. 173.

<sup>2</sup> Mémoires du clergé de France, vii., 14, 24.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, P. L., xx., 516.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, P. L., xx., 774.

<sup>5</sup> Migne, P. L., xx., 778.

<sup>6</sup> Migne, P. L., l., 610.

<sup>7</sup> Migne, P. L., liv., 615.

<sup>8</sup> Migne, P. L., lviii., 22-28 ; lxii., 66.

It was in the fifth century that Zeno, Bishop of Seville, was created vicar apostolic in Spain by Pope Simplicius.<sup>1</sup> In the following century one of his successors, Sallustius, received from Pope Hormisdas the same powers to be exercised in Portugal.<sup>2</sup> The mission confided to St. Boniface, of Germany, was, in the beginning, rather of a missionary character than a Vicariate Apostolic in the proper sense. However, he became Vicar Apostolic when made Archbishop of Cologne and afterwards of Mayence. It is well known that he became famous throughout all Germany as Vicar of the Holy See, reformed churches, established bishoprics, celebrated national and provincial synods. This goes to show that the attributes of vicars were very extensive. For instance, the Vicar of Thessalonica had the right to visit churches, examine and approve candidates for the episcopate, examine and consecrate metropolitans, convoke synods and transmit their acts to Rome, dispense metropolitans from residence, receive petitions addressed to the Holy See for immediate decision or transmission to the Pope, and, finally, even to judge major causes.

But the vicariates, like all things human subject to vicissitudes, gradually became weak and infrequent. From the ninth century vicars were replaced by primates or *legati nati*, so called in contradistinction to *legati a latere*, the former being occupants of some see and natives of the country where they were the representatives of the Sovereign Pontiff. The *legati nati* differ from the former vicars only in the name, the greater number and the less extended jurisdiction. We find them located at Lyons, Narbonne, Toledo, Mayence, Salzburg, Cologne, Treves, Prague. Many acts concerning them indicate plainly their character. Adrian IV., in a letter of October 7, 1157, names as his representative for the whole Teutonic Empire, Hillinus, Archbishop of Treves, to act as legate of the Holy See, "*ut ibi legationis officio apostolicæ sedis auctoritate fungatur.*" For this purpose he is given full powers, "*plenariam a nobis recipiens potestatem.*" Bishops are commanded to render obedience to the legate as to the Pope himself, "*eidem tanquam apostoli æ sedis legato, et cui vices nostras in hac parte duximus indulgendas, jure legationis studeatis sicut nobis ipsis specialius et diligentius inter alios obedire.*"<sup>3</sup> To the exercise of the powers of such legates we find two conditions often set: that they shall send annually to Rome messengers to bring back instructions, that every third year they shall visit in person the Sovereign Pontiff, "*ut dulcissimi fratres ad primogenitum fratrem.*" We might add a third condition, the abeyance of their powers in the presence of a *legatus a latere*.<sup>4</sup> The unfitness of many of the *legati nati* in the darkest times of the Middle Ages, the jealousy of the ordi-

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P. L., lviii., 35.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, P. L., clxxxviii., 1438.

<sup>2</sup> Migne, P. L., lxiii., 425.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, P. L., cxliii., 594.

naries of the land and the consequent dissensions frequently made very difficult the execution of their office. Hence the necessity forced on the Holy See to send abroad *legati a latere* taken from the Roman Curia. The history of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries is filled with the doings and sendings of those latter representatives, among whom may be cited as chief models, Peter Damian and Hildebrand, two wonderful men destined by Providence, the one to bring about the interior reformation of the hierarchy, the other to liberate the Church from the degradation and stain of slavery to kings and emperors.

Finally, "considering the interior dissensions caused by primates," the Popes as early as the fifteenth century found themselves obliged to withdraw from them the representation of the Holy See and to send to Germany, France, Spain, Portugal and other kingdoms nuncios foreign to the country and to all parties, prelates distinguished by ecclesiastical position and agreeable to the sovereigns. Thus came into being the nunciatures at Catholic courts and capitals."<sup>1</sup> We shall return to this new institution later on.

Now, take your stand on the summits of history, consider the long series of Pontifical Representatives, Vicars, Primates, Nuncios, do you not see that their institution is an essential and natural part of the mechanism of church government, that its result is most beneficial? The Pope is the head directing the mystical Body of Christ, the heart to which flows, from which ebbs, the life-giving blood, the central force that sends movement to all parts of the circumference. Legates are the nervous conductors stretching from the head to all the members, the channels through which moves the vital circulation, the human instruments by which the Popes have maintained unity in the Church—unity, that wonderful but difficult result considering the many passions of mankind. Through its legates the Holy See secures independence in relation with the civil power, preserves the distinction of the two powers, which is the main principle of civilization, creates, maintains, restores, and purifies the churches of each country, guides and directs to fruitful results the councils, as, for instance, Nicea and Trent. Looking at the matter from this height, what are the defects inseparable from human action, the weaknesses, the incapacities, the cupidities, the treasons even? They are scarcely visible and noticeable; scarcely audible to the ear, low and faint across the stretch of centuries, come the cries and lamentations that deplorable abuses have forced from holy souls. Taking history all in all, we are compelled to bless the great Pontiffs, Gelasius, Innocent, Leo, Nicolas I., Gregory VII., Leo IX., Innocent III., Nicolas V., and others of later centuries who have in-

<sup>1</sup> Responsio super nunt, p. 258.

stituted and organized the representation of the See of Peter throughout the world.

*Delegations Sent to Civil Powers.*

From the divine constitution of the Church and from the prerogatives of the Apostolic See is derived the right which the popes possess of sending representatives to secular governments—a right which they have made use of from the earliest times and with the happiest results for Christian civilization.

The Church is not merely an association, a syndicate, or a body corporate; it is a juridical society, perfect, independent, supreme. This is a principle of Catholicism on which Leo XIII. has repeatedly insisted, as, for instance, in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei*: “Haec societas est genere et jure perfecta, cum adjumenta ad incolumitatem actionemque suam necessaria, voluntate beneficioque conditoris sui, omnia in se et per se ipsa possideat.” Consequently, the Pope, as head of the Church, is a sovereign, because sovereignty consists in free, supreme, and independent authority.

Such being its nature, the Church is distinct from civil society as regards its character, its purpose, and the means whereby this is attained. Confusion of the two societies is impossible. This fundamental principle, the very basis of Christian freedom, was set forth as clearly and as firmly by the great bishops of the fourth century and by the doctors of the middle ages as it is to-day by Leo XIII. It is essentially Catholic.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that distinction is not isolation. Though not identified, civil government and ecclesiastical government are, in certain respects, necessarily bound together. They do not stand to each other as nations whose borders are the same or whose commercial interests are common. The relations of Church and State are far more intimate. They are as two societies composed of the same members, as two authorities ruling, each in its proper sphere, the same subjects. For the individual who, as a man, is a citizen, is, as a Christian, a child of the Church. Whence it follows that the two powers cannot ignore each other's existence, nor pretend to walk their several ways without heed for their mutual interests. A measure adopted by civil authority for the temporal welfare of the citizen may involve his spiritual harm; and, conversely, an action of ecclesiastical power intended to promote the spiritual interests of the faithful may be injurious from the temporal point of view. An understanding of some sort must, therefore, be arrived at between the two dominations.

To give these relations their concrete form, three different means

have been employed. There is, first of all, the *alliance* or union whereby Church and State, in order to attain their respective objects with greater sureness and facility, uphold each other with the mutual support of their authority and by their concerted action. In a second sort of *régime*, which may be styled that of *parity*, the secular power observes neutrality in regard to various religious organizations, to each and all of which it guarantees equality and protection. Then in the third place, there is the system of *liberty*, *universal tolerance*, indifference or separation, according to which, the State neither favors exclusively any denomination nor proscribes any form of religion, but professes to recognize and even to safeguard, entire liberty of conscience and of worship. It is on this principle that constitutional law accords to all religious bodies the rights of organization and of self-government. These are, in the main, the bases of agreement between the civil and the ecclesiastical power. Others might easily be devised; but, be their particular terms what they may, some relations of the sort must exist.

Now, according to the law of nations, both natural and positive, every sovereign power is entitled to representation abroad, or, in other words, has a right to see that its interests are looked after by its envoys. Consequently, and with much greater reason, the Pope has a right to send his legates to secular governments; for the relations existing between Church and State are more intimate and essential than those in which nation and nation are concerned; the interests at stake are of more vital importance; the authority of the Pontiff is higher and more sacred.

This papal right does not assume the union of Church and State, nor the existence of special concordats, nor even the profession of Catholic belief by the civil authorities or by a majority of their subjects. It is founded in the very nature of things. To set it aside, one must deny that the Church is an independent juridical society, or question the sovereignty of its head, or refuse to recognize the possibility of relations between Church and State. Let us see what the logical consequences are. In the first case, it would follow that the Church is a simple association in subjection to the civil power, that there is no distinction between the two powers, and that the Protestant principle is correct—*cujus regio illius et religio*.<sup>1</sup> Again, to admit that the Pope is the head of a perfect society and at the same time to deny his sovereignty, is a contradiction in terms. It will be objected, of course, that according to the generally accepted view, a sovereign must have territory, and that the Pope has none. This condition, we reply, might hold good for temporal and circumscribed power; it cannot affect a government that is spiritual and universal. As a matter of fact, however, the possession of territory is not essential even to secular

<sup>1</sup> Ant. Schmidt, *Thesaurus*, III., 551 (Franck).



rule. Mr. Hall, in his "Treatise on International Law,"<sup>1</sup> has shown that those who make such possession a requisite for sovereignty, are guided by medieval traditions rather than by the established principles of modern law. In the feudal system power and land ownership were one, and this notion made its way into international law; but it is by no means equivalent to a fixed and necessary principle. Quite recently, in the Plessis-Bellière case, Melcot, the Attorney-General, admitted without the least hesitation that the Pope is an independent ruler, and proved on Puffendorf's authority, that the doctrine in vogue requiring as essentials for the State an agglomeration of individuals and a territory, is far too narrow: the body politic to which we give the name "State" results from a union of wills and of forces, which forms the most powerful sort of society.

Lastly, the refusal to acknowledge relations between Church and State shows a total misconception of the matter and a blindness to the reality of facts. How Bluntschli could have asserted that the spiritual supremacy of the Pope has no more to do with the State than the pretensions of a great philosopher who should set himself up as the highest authority in the scientific world, is beyond our comprehension. For the same author concedes that the ecclesiastical influence of the Papacy upon the relations of the Roman Church with Sovereign States—relations analogous to those that subsist between nations—suffices to invest the envoys of the Holy See with the dignity of ambassadors. Hence Prussia and Russia, after breaking off their relations with Rome, were obliged to resume them. Even England, though always opposed to diplomatic intercourse with the Holy See, has, on various occasions, sent her agents to negotiate with Leo XIII.

The right, therefore, of appointing representatives to secular governments, is inherent in the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and, as such, has always been maintained by the Popes. In connection, for instance, with the Belgian incident of 1880, Leo XIII. expressed himself in terms that are as remarkable as they are unambiguous. "*Cumque jus potestatemque habeat Pontifex Maximus Nuntios aut Legatos ad exteras gentes, nominatim catholici nominis, earumque principes mittendi, de violato hujusmodi jure cum iis quos penes est culpa, expostulamus; eoque magis quod ejus juris multo augustius est in Romano Pontifice principium, cum ab amplissima auctoritate primatus, quem ille divinitus obtinet in universam Ecclesiam proficiscatur.*"

This right, moreover, has always been acknowledged by the general consent of civilized nations. Evidently this consent did not establish the Pope's right, but it would have sufficed for creating that right had none such existed. And this consideration

<sup>1</sup> Oxford, 1890.

should be conclusive even for those who do not admit that the constitution of the Church is divine, for no one will deny that the acquiescence of all peoples is a source of international law. We insist then, if the Pope's legates are received by secular governments, if they have the rank of ambassadors and international agents, this is in virtue of a solidly established right and not merely in token of good-will, condescension, or respect for ancient traditions.

The Pope, without doubt, possessed, until lately, a temporal domain. *De jure* he possesses it always, and *de facto*, even, he holds a remnant of it in the few acres which the Vatican covers. But it is not this principality, either large or small, that has made the Pope a sovereign. It is not upon any strip of territory that are based, either exclusively or essentially, his international relations. He was a sovereign before he possessed a foot of the "Patrimony of St. Peter," and a sovereign he remains, though his dominions have been wrested from his sway. It is as head of the Church that he to day receives kings and emperors, and that he welcomes the diplomatic representatives of foreign powers. Likewise, in commissioning his legates, he acts as Supreme Pontiff rather than as ruler of the papal domain. Bluntschli declares this emphatically: "It is as heads of the Church and not as masters of a State, as popes and not as kings, that the Pontiffs obtained the first place in the society of princes. It is in this quality that they sent legates, nuncios, and internuncios to the courts of the world, and that they negotiated concordats, the contents of which has nothing to do either with the patrimony of St. Peter or with the inhabitants of the States of the Church." At the beginning of this century the French Minister of the Interior wrote to the Duc de Richelieu: "The Pope himself, though he be regarded neither as a foreign sovereign nor as a temporal prince, is none the less, as head of the Church and as Sovereign Pontiff, an independent power."

The right to maintain international relations belongs, as a rule, to sovereign power, and therefore the management of relations between Church and State pertains chiefly to papal authority, and only in a subordinate and exceptional way to the episcopate of any country. This much is clear from the words addressed by Cardinal Jacobini to the Nuncio Rampolla: "Conviene poi notare ch  nello stesso articolo (in the *Siglo Futuro*) si afferma la preminenza del diritto dei Vescovi sopra quello del Nunzio intorno alle questioni riguardanti le relazioni tra la chiesa e lo Stato, senza per  avvertire ch  questioni siffatte, appunto perch  hanno rapporto cogli interessi di tutto il cattolismo e dei cattolici di un dato stato, nel quale sono comprese piu diocesi, appartengono in

particolare maniera al Rappresentante del sommo Pontefice; e l'azione relativa dei Vescovi, sia singolarmente presi, sia presi collettivamente in uno stato, deve essere sempre subordinata al capo Supremo della Chiesa ed in conseguenza a chi lo rappresenta."

The first representatives sent by the Holy See to civil powers were the *apocrisarii* or *responsales*. Whether this office can be traced back to the days of Constantine is doubtful. Hincmar's authority on this point is not decisive. The earliest documents which we have date from the time of the Council of Chalcedon. Aware of the dangers that threatened the Church, St. Leo resolved to send as his representative to the emperor a man "brought up by the Holy See and imbued with its spirit and doctrine." His choice fell upon Julian, Bishop of Cos in the Archipelago. There is yet extant what may be termed the brief of delegation—the 113th letter of St. Leo. We have also, in the 111th, addressed to the Emperor Marcian, the "letter of credentials," as we would say in modern parlance: "Illud quoque clementiæ vestræ benevolentiam peto, ut fratrem nostrum Julianum episcopum, in vestro, sicut facere dignamini habeatis affectu; cujus obsequiis præsentia meæ vobis imago reddatur. Nam et de fidei ejus sinceritate confidens, vicem ipsi meam contra temporis hæreticos delegavi; atque propter ecclesiarum pacisque custodiam, ut a comitatu vestro non abesset exegi; cujus suggestiones pro concordia catholicæ unitatis tanquam meas audire dignemini." In the 112th letter we find a recommendation addressed to the Empress Pulcheria.<sup>1</sup>

Among those who later on held similar positions as delegated by the Holy See may be mentioned St. Gregory the Great. In his "Dialogues," lib. iii., c. 36, he tells us: "Dum jussione Pontificis mei, Constantinopolitanæ urbis palatio responsis ecclesiasticis observirem." Elevated to the papal throne, he placed the welfare of souls above all temporal considerations, and deigned to send a representative to the Emperor Phocas. The troubles growing out of the Monophysite heresy forced this apocrisarius to withdraw, but as soon as peace was restored Constantine Pogonatus petitioned Pope Leo II. to appoint another representative. "Hortamur vero vestram sanctissimam summitatem, ut quamprimum mittat designatum ab ea apocrisarium; ut is in regia urbe degat, et in emergentibus sive dogmaticis sive canonicis, ac prorsus in omnibus ecclesiasticis negotiis vestræ Sanctitatis exprimat ac gerat personam."

The office of Apocrisarius came to an end in the Orient during the eighth century on account of disturbances caused by the Iconoclasts. With the restoration of the western empire by Leo III.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P. L., liv., 1019-1027.

came the establishment, at the new imperial court, of positions and titles analagous to those at Constantinople. In these circles the envoys of Rome were treated with the honor befitting their station. But the weakening and division of the empire under the unworthy successors of Charlemagne and the discords which ensued made it both useless and impossible to have permanent apostolic legates at the court of the Franks. Causes more deplorable still prevented the maintenance of delegations at the German imperial courts. From time to time, however, the Pope sent his representatives, entrusted with a temporary mission, not only to Christian potentates but also to infidel rulers. At length, as the modern era dawned and great national unities were solidified in definite form, the papal *apocrisarii* reappeared under the title of *nuncios*.

The latter, it must be noted, like their predecessors, are not simply diplomatic envoys; they are invested, moreover, with ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This is evident, as regards the Apocrisarii, from the documents which have already been cited. Nor is it less clear in the case of the nuncios, for, to omit other quotations, we find that Cardinal Jacobini, after stating that the nuncios have no other authority than that which is communicated to them, says in his letter: "E però vero ch  il sommo pontefice d  ai suoi nunzii una missione puramente diplomatica senza veruna autorit  sopra i pastori ed i fideli esistenti negli stati presso i quali sono essi accreditati? Pu  ammettersi ch  il Santo Padre mandi i suoi Nunzii come i governi civili mandano i loro ministri e rappresentanti? Dai relativi brevi ed istruzioni apparisce invece ch  i nunzii apostolici hanno una missione non puramente diplomatica, ma autoritativa riguardo ai fideli ed alle cose religiose." It would seem that the powers conferred on papal nuncios awaken suspicions in certain quarters and are regarded as a source of danger by some well-meaning people. But a moment's reflection will show that there is no need of such alarm. The scope of these powers is limited to spiritual matters, with which secular governments have nothing to do, and in which they disclaim all interference.

After what we have said in the foregoing, we need not dwell long on the excellent results which have been obtained by the appointing of legates to secular governments. By this means more than by any other the Popes have christianized nations. As Audisio very happily says: "That, in regard to purity of morals, equity of law, moderation of government, in regard to all those virtues which bind man to his fellow-men and raise him up to God, Christian civilization is the exact opposite of paganism, is a truth which no one will question. But who will dare say that this civilization was formed by the sword of pagan or half-pagan emperors? And if it is due to the ceaseless, strenuous efforts of the

Christian priesthood, how could it have asserted itself and mounted to the very throne of the empire, in order to transform it, without bringing it into close and continuous contact with the priesthood and with the Pontiff, who rules in religion as the emperor rules in the state? And how could the Pontiff, residing personally in Rome, have transferred his presence, so to speak, to Constantinople and have faced the thousand difficulties that arise unexpectedly in a new order of things, except through the action of his representative? Hampered as it was and imperfectly understood by the emperors, this action was, nevertheless, in perfect conformity with the essentials of Christian society, which calls for the efficacious co-operation of the two supreme social authorities, the Church and the state."<sup>1</sup>

It is by their legates also that the Popes have lent such a powerful defence to Christian civilization in forming those leagues that withstood the onset of the Mussulman. It is through their legates that, after laboring so long to bring about peace between Christian nations, the Popes prepared the way for a world-wide human society. "The Catholicity of the Church," says Audisio, "and her universal diplomacy necessarily begot the idea of fraternity in the whole race and taught the nations to agree upon their common interest through the mediation of ambassadors."<sup>2</sup> Nor need we repeat that, by means of their legates, the Popes have over and over again shielded the rights of the people from the excesses of tyranny, social purity from the debauch of worthless princes and international peace from the ruptures that heedless ambition desired and provoked. Bygone instances need not here be cited. It will be sufficient to recall the services rendered by the diplomacy of Leo XIII. to Germany, France and Spain. In the midst of passion and political strife the action of the Pope has everywhere been put forward in the interests of peace.

## II.—THE AMERICAN DELEGATION.

Superficial minds are sometimes astonished at the importance given by popes to the maintenance and development of Apostolic delegations. Their solicitude on this point has been often laid to ambition, to greed for mastery, and in our days it is taxed as vanity or anxiety to find some compensation for the loss of the temporal power. How far from the truth are such appreciations! If the popes attach so much importance to delegations, the real reason is that the institution is the best means to assure the prosperity of the Christian peoples, the most emphatic expression of the two fundamental principles, that the Church is a perfect society and that in the Church the Sovereign Pontiff has full, ordi-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, c. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, c. 15.

nary, and immediate jurisdiction. Delegations, therefore, are the plain showing forth of the position held by the Papacy in the Church, of the position held by the Church in the world.

On these high considerations must we take our stand to account for the establishment of the Apostolic Delegation in the United States. It is due not only and mainly to accidental and transitory causes, it is the natural consequence of first principles and Catholic tradition. The Church of the United States has an existence of a hundred years; it has had a wonderful development, which perhaps has reached its climax as far as the hierarchy is concerned. It was to be expected that the Pope should wish to be present through his representative in the midst of the fourteen archbishops and sixty-nine bishops that now constitute the hierarchy of the Church in the United States. By that presence this young Church takes rank with her elder sisters of France, Austria, Spain, Belgium, and rises to the dignity of the earlier Churches of Gaul, Germany, Illyria. The reasons that actuated former popes to appoint representatives to Arles, Seville, Thessalonica operate to-day to induce Leo to send his representative to Washington. Distance from the centre, multiplicity of affairs, difficulty of correct information in spite of our present rapid communication, make necessary the presence of pontifical agents to-day as in past centuries.

The American Delegation is ecclesiastical and not diplomatic. The Holy Father has commissioned his representative to the Church of the United States with definite powers to be exercised in his name, powers which it is not our present business to detail. He has not commissioned him to the government of the United States. We believe he had no thought of so doing; we have yet to learn that any overture in this direction has been made or is even contemplated. Our peculiar political condition, public opinion among us, and various other elements to be taken into account, may be unfavorable to such a move. Abstracting from those, is there in the Constitution of the United States anything that would fundamentally oppose such a representation? We feel like answering negatively; we do not see why the Constitution should be said to oppose such a representation any more than it does liberty and equality of creeds, separation of Church and State. Papal legates are not sent to meddle in civil affairs, nor to give governments the right to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs. They are sent to prevent politico-religious conflicts, to maintain a mutual good understanding between the spiritual and the temporal, without sacrifice of or interference with the reciprocal independence of either. All serious thinkers acknowledge that the Church has in this country a great mission, a national mission as

to social questions, as to the assimilation of the foreign elements in our population. What should hinder an understanding with the Head of the Church on these and other like interests?

However, these are only our personal views. Let us pass on to the fruits expected by the Holy Father from the delegation he has established. Above all, a greater and stronger union of the American Church with the Holy See. Such a union will import into our Church more of the Christian life centred in Rome and by reaction will export the influence of this fresh and vigorous republic into the Universal Church. National churches are members of the great Catholic body, and the more they partake of the life of the Mother Church, the more they exercise action abroad and contribute to the prosperity of the other members. See for instance what the Catholic world owes to the noble Church of Spain for its glorious galaxy of saintly and learned men, for its grand examples of Christian virtues and heroism in all the walks of life. Whoever scans attentively the course of events can see that this young Church of the United States is destined by Providence to a leading part in the future of the world. But it is equally clear that it is only by the strictest union with Rome that she can be prepared, trained and guided in the fulfilment of that glorious destiny.

A second result will be a more perfect unity within the American Church by virtue of the presence of the papal representative, greater concord and harmony of action and consequently greater force of expansion and resistance. For, as Pius VI. wrote to the Electors, the Church has nothing to fear from outside foes when the members are solidly bound to the head.

A third result will be the strengthening of episcopal authority by virtue of the enlightened support which each bishop will receive in the discharge of his delicate duties. The Council of the Vatican, while defining the prerogatives of the Holy See, was careful to add that the supreme power of the Pope, far from diminishing the authority of the Episcopate, consecrated and confirmed it; and the Council adopted as its own the beautiful words of St. Gregory the Great to Eulogius of Alexandria: "*Mcus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tunc ego vere honoratus sum cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*" Leo XIII. may be said to have taken special pains to realize this principle. One of the characteristics that history will attribute to his pontificate will be the support he has given to bishops. Everywhere and at all times he has vindicated the rights and the honor of the Episcopate. He has never ceased to inculcate respect and submission of the faithful and the clergy to their chief pastors, as is abundantly proved by his Encyclicals to the Bishops of Spain,

France, Italy and to the Archbishops of Paris and Tours. Such has ever been the tradition of the Holy See.

A fourth result will be the security of the sacerdotal body by the development of a spirit of justice and equity on the one hand, of respect and noble obedience on the other. A fifth result must surely be order in the Catholic army—increase of zeal and devotion to all good works. Finally, a sixth result will be peace and concord with the civil power. The spirit of the Holy See is not one of exaggeration and *intransigence*, but one of prudence, moderation, opportune concessions, respect for national institutions. Nothing is so dreaded by the Holy See as politico religious conflicts. Popes have sought always to prevent them by all just and laudable means; they have gone to the length of the greatest sacrifices, stopping short of dogmatic principles, to end dissensions with the governments.

Such are the benefits that may be expected from the apostolic delegation to the United States. But to secure them certain conditions are necessary, or rather certain duties are incumbent on the Catholics of the country. To speak only of two that we consider the most important, we name *honor* and *support*. Undoubtedly the first duty is to give due honor to the Pope's representative. Pope St. Boniface, writing to the Bishop of Thessaly about his vicar, says: "Be mindful of the respect you owe to the head."<sup>1</sup> St. Sixtus says to the prelates of Illyria: "It behooves you to respect and honor your chief, for the honor of the chief redounds to the sanctification of the members."<sup>2</sup> And in his letter to the bishops of the Synod of Thessalonica, the same Pope clearly lays down that the vicar apostolic among them is not intended to absorb all authority and honor; that he must cause no harm to the rights and honor of the Metropolitans; but, on the other hand, they must not deprive him of the honor of being their superior; they should honor him all the more that they themselves are honored by the Holy See.<sup>3</sup>

A second duty of Catholics is to give moral support and aid to the Papal delegate. St. Gregory II. claims this favor, nay, imposes this obligation on the bishops of Germany, to whom he commissions St. Boniface as his representative: "Ut contra quoslibet adversarios, quibus in Domino praevalitis, instantissime defendatis."<sup>4</sup> This obligation, to which bishops bind themselves by oath on the day of their consecration, concerns priests also, and, in a certain measure, all the children of the Church. It is felony, it is high treason against the Papal sovereignty to create opposition to an apostolic delegate, falsify or travesty his acts and inten-

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P. L., xx., 778.

<sup>2</sup> P. L., l., 618.

<sup>3</sup> P. L., l., 614.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, P. L., lxxxix., 501.



tions, provoke against him suspicion and diffidence. "Omnem laesisti Christianitatem . . . laesisti apostolos quorum est princeps Petrus," wrote the Council of Paris to the Duke of Brittany, and the expression is not too strong for disloyalty to the representative of the Holy See.<sup>1</sup>

So far we have been occupied with principles and facts. In conclusion we beg leave to say a word of the persons whose honored names underlie the thoughts and words of this article; we mean His Holiness Leo XIII., and His Excellency the Most Rev. Francis Satolli.

Cicero, in a letter to his brother Quintus, says that Plato thought republics would be happy if the government were given to the learned and the wise, or at least to men whose chief pursuit in life was science and wisdom; the alliance of power and wisdom would safeguard society.<sup>2</sup>

This alliance of authority, learning, and wisdom you will find generally in the Roman Pontiffs; and surely it is pre-eminent in the wonderful man, philosopher and statesman, who now sits on the throne of Peter, and for seventeen years has governed the Catholic Church, restoring it to its place of honor among the nations.

At the end of the work we have so often cited, Audisio sums up the qualities required in the ecclesiastical diplomat. The first quality is knowledge of the public law of the Church and of Christian nations. Then he must know how to adapt himself to all governments; how to bless them and be blessed by them. Moreover, since the Church is above all earthly politics, he must understand that his special virtue is to be the faithful friend of the nation where he makes his home. As crown of all civil and moral virtues comes priestly piety. Thus fitted he may, in the words of St. Bernard, procure "*pacem regnis, quietem monasteriis, ecclesiis ordinem, clericis disciplinam, Deo populum acceptabilem, sectatorem bonorum operum.*" Theological and canonical science, understanding and love of the institutions and the people of the United States, sacerdotal piety—these are three qualities that no American will deny to the representative of Leo XIII. in Washington.

T. BOUQUILLON.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

<sup>1</sup> Hardouin, v., 19.

<sup>2</sup> Ille princeps ingenii et doctrinae Plato, tum demum fore beatas respublicas putavit, si aut docti aut sapientes homines eas regere coepissent; aut ii qui regerent omne suum studium in doctrina et sapientia collocarent. Hanc conjunctionem videlicet potestatis ac sapientiae saluti censuit civitatibus esse posse.

## THE RELATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

THE growth of a science implies contact with other sciences. It obeys certain laws analogous to those which govern the development of organisms. As life requires the continual adjustment of internal relations and external relations, so is the vitality of a science maintained not only by the proper conception and solution of its own problems, but also by the adaptation of its work to that which is done in neighboring branches. This adaptation, in the main, is of a double character; each science acts upon those which form its environment, and in turn is affected by their influence. There is thus established, within a given sphere, a co-operation whereby the various sciences are mutually helpful, an interchange of good offices from which all derive profit.

Connections of this sort are effected in different ways, and are closer in some cases than in others. Lines of research which formally and in view of their special purposes diverge, may have their material object in common. The same substance, or the same set of phenomena, is often examined simultaneously by the physicist and by the chemist, while the same structures are of interest to the anatomist and to the physiologist. Under these circumstances, it is but natural that progress in one branch should affect the research that is carried on in others. Apart, however, from such a community of objects, there may exist among allied sciences a community of interests, inasmuch as results obtained in any particular investigation suggest new problems in quite a different order, and serve instrumentally for their solution. So it has happened that physiology, within the last fifty years, has made unprecedented advance by pressing physical methods into its service. Finally, those sciences which keep up no direct intercourse within their empirical limits, may meet on the higher plane of generalization. Starting from widely different points of view, and moving along separate paths of research, they may, in seeking a final interpretation, converge upon the same comprehensive principle. Hence the far-reaching importance of the law of the conservation of energy.

Experimental psychology, in less than half a century, has passed through all these phases of interaction, and still feels their influence. Its field is, to a great extent, identical with that of the elder introspective psychology. Its methods are constructed on data supplied partly by the latter science and partly by physiology.

Its results have compelled the notice of physiologists and psychologists alike. This would have happened if psychology had always been as thoroughly empirical as botany and geology. But by reason of its long and intimate relation with metaphysics it has, while taking its actual direction, drawn attention from higher quarters. Philosophy, of course, has interests at stake, and the philosophers have not been slow in telling us what these interests are, and how they might be advanced, retarded, or imperilled.

The new psychology, therefore, at the very beginning of its existence, is environed by manifold influences to which its activity must respond. One aspect of this correspondence we have already presented in showing what psychology owes to the natural sciences.<sup>1</sup> There remain now to be studied its claims to scientific recognition and its philosophical bearings, both speculative and practical.

As was shown in our former article, the leading feature of the modern science is the application of the experimental method, and it is with this that we are here occupied. When, on some future occasion, the aims, procedure and results of comparative psychology shall have been fully explained, its philosophical consideration will be in order. For the present, we have to inquire whether experimental methods come within the scope of psychology; whether they are bettered or vitiated by philosophical implications; and whether they may be used to advantage by the adherents of a certain philosophical system.

### I.

To decide whether a particular science may consistently employ a particular method, is at first sight an easy matter. Knowing exactly the scope of the science and the problems with which it deals, we have only to see whether the solution of these is attained, or at least attainable, by the method in question. Given, therefore, a definite range for psychology, the use of experimental methods would seem to be justified, if they help us to understand more clearly the subjects which our science must handle, if they throw additional light on truths already established and open up a store of facts that were hitherto but vaguely known or entirely unknown. With these principles for our guidance and with a fair knowledge of what has actually been accomplished by experiment, we should find no difficulty in according the new method a place in the service of psychology. As a matter of fact, experimental methods have secured such a place, and the only way to dispute their right is to show that "psychology" has, in general acceptance, a meaning and a purpose which demand their exclusion.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for July, 1894.

To do this, however, a proper acquaintance with the methods is necessary. So long as their nature is obscure, the wisest course is to suspend judgment. And if it finally appear that they are beyond comprehension, or that it would cost too much to render them intelligible, the whole question had better be adjourned. But to reach a definite conclusion, either positive or negative, one must understand the methods. Even to conclude with Prof. James<sup>1</sup> that Fechner's notions are "patient whimsies," one should be familiar with some portion of the "dreadful literature" in which they are expounded and discussed. That this literature is already extensive and is constantly growing, we need not here repeat. It is by no means "light reading"; it requires as much patience on the part of the student as it evinces on the part of the authors. But whoever makes his way through it will be able to state clearly what is required for understanding the science and its methods.

We read of late: "Really, to understand the new psychology, there is need of nothing more than physiology and physics." This is simple enough. Five pages farther: "*To begin to understand*" what all these methods mean, we have to take our stand in the formalism of Kant, or in the idealistic realism of Herbart, or in some go-between system . . . such as Wundt has devised." Now, no one will suspect that the criticism containing these passages was written from any such dangerous "stand." Our main difficulty is in bringing the two statements to something like consistency. If physiology and physics are alone sufficient to understand the new psychology, it does not seem probable that the understanding of its *methods* should oblige us to take such a plunge into metaphysics. The methods are surely an essential part of the science. Can this be mastered apart from them? Or are we to infer that Kantism, Herbartism, and Wundtism permeate physiology and physics? It is not for us to decide which of these questions should be affirmatively answered, but for the sake of those who may be similarly perplexed when comparing the alleged requisites, we suggest two others that harmonize better. The first is to study the methods in some reliable text-book, such as Wundt's "Grundzüge";<sup>2</sup> the second, to spend a semester or so in a psychological laboratory. Physiology and physics will be found useful; mathematics will do no harm; and if the student, in addition, has a tolerable power of self-observation, he will make good prog-

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of Psychology*, London, 1890, i., p. 549.

<sup>2</sup> Italics ours.

<sup>3</sup> *Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie*, 4te Aufl. Leipzig, 1893. "Grundzüge" is sometimes translated "Sketch," but this English term is misleading when applied to a work of some 1300 pages in 8vo. See also Külpe. *Grundriss der Psychologie*, Leipzig, 1893.

ress without taking much thought of philosophic systems either past or present.

If, furthermore, he be gifted with ordinary intelligence, he will perceive that it is one thing to sketch the growth of psychology and another to prove that it is an exact science. Its exactness or inexactness depends upon the sort of methods which it employs, and which can be examined without the least allusion to the history of the science. Such history is none the less instructive, and our student may read it with profit. Should he do so, his ethical notions will probably forbid him to arbitrarily cut up an outline into "proofs," and to swell their number by others of his own fancying in order to display his critical acumen. Neither Weber nor Fechner ever followed these tactics, which, after all, are no help to an understanding of psycho-physical methods.

To mark off the limits of psychology is more difficult than one might suppose. Sylvester Maurus observes that "all the divisions made by wise men, though founded on the nature of things, have something arbitrary about them and might have been differently made."<sup>1</sup> He is speaking, not of divisions made to suit critics, but of the partition of knowledge, and in this sense his assertion is borne out by the history of scientific terminology. For though the names originally given to the sciences have for the most part survived, their meaning has, in many instances, been modified. Physiology is no longer the "science of nature," nor is zoology a "treatise on living things." The meaning of these terms has been restricted. On the other hand, geometry is something more than "land-measurement," just as chemistry has other purposes than the "study of juices," both sciences having widened their fields of investigation beyond the limits set by etymology. The literal derivation of its name may indicate in a general fashion the nature of a science; it is not always the safest criterion for determining the precise scope of that science. If it be found that "psychology," in the course of time, has either widened or narrowed its signification, and that the object of the science is variously defined, no mere appeal to etymology will put an end to these differences or correct these deviations.

Is *usage* more decisive? Arbitrary as the wise may be in making their divisions and in employing terms, the development of terminology as a whole is not altogether a matter of accidental variations. It is, in a larger sense, what progress in the use of words is for the individual mind. A child who is learning to speak, employs his few expressions to denote all sorts of persons and things;

<sup>1</sup> *Questiones Philosophicæ*, l. i., q. 5. We do not see why this author or any other should be quoted at second hand—unless it be desirable to impose a double task on the reader.

his power of generalization outstrips the growth of his vocabulary. Later on, as he is taught the proper name for each particular object and action, he retains the more general terms but gives them narrower meanings. And, finally, he is enabled, by observation and experience, to apply words in their specific sense to an ever-increasing number of individual objects. For the child, then, there are alternating phases of contraction and expansion which must be passed through, before language can acquire in his mind its definite symbolical character.

Similarly, in the earlier stages of knowledge considered as a racial acquisition, its branches are comparatively few, and the name of each is comprehensive in proportion. But as investigation furnishes new data, division and classification become necessary, and, as a consequence, specialized names are required. The result is, in some cases, a new term, like "Histology," which is an offshoot of anatomy, or like "Calculus," a highly developed branch of mathematics. In other cases the parent-name is kept, and is qualified by an adjective which expresses the leading feature of the specialized science. Thus we get "Molecular Physics," "Organic Chemistry," "Dogmatic Theology," and "Moral Theology." Specialization at times imports a restriction of the subject matter, and at other times the treatment of the same matter by different methods. But whatever course terminology, in particular instances, may follow, the guiding principle is the same, here extending and there limiting the application of words, according as the division of labor requires.

"Psychology" has not escaped these vicissitudes. To the early philosophers the term was unknown. Nineteen centuries before its introduction Aristotle taught that the study of the psyche belonged to physics.<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas has given us one of his best psychological treatises in the "Summa Theologica." And it is not uncommon to find psychology included, by his successors, under the heading of "Special Metaphysics." Both in the Greek philosophy and in mediæval scholasticism, the science of mind was integrated with other sciences of a wider and deeper scope; its differentiation belongs to a more recent period.

Since the days of Melancthon,<sup>2</sup> Goclenus,<sup>3</sup> and Casmann,<sup>4</sup> who

<sup>1</sup> *De Anima*, lib. i.; *Cf. Phys.*, lib. ii. St. Thomas, in his "Commentary" on the latter (Lect. IV.), says that the soul, inasmuch as it is the form of the body, is treated by the naturalist; but so far as it is separable from the body, by the metaphysician. It is in this restricted sense that he understands the words of Aristotle: Ἰὼς δ' ἔχει τὸ χωριστὸν καὶ τί ἐστὶ, φιλοσοφίας τῆς πρώτης διορίσται ἔργον.

<sup>2</sup> He is said to have first used the term to designate the subject of academic lectures.

<sup>3</sup> *Psychologia*, Marburg, 1590

<sup>4</sup> *Psychologia Anthropologica*, Hannover, 1594.

seem to have devised the term, "psychology" has had a variety of meanings. For those who were loyal to the Aristotelian philosophy, psychology meant the science of the soul in the broadest acceptation of this term. By the English successors of Locke, it was restricted to the study of mental phenomena. And many who claimed that psychology should include both phenomena and soul, accepted with Christian Wolff the distinction between "empirical" and "rational" psychology. It would be interesting, from the historical point of view, to trace this development and single out its factors. We might also, with profit, compare the definitions of psychology that are offered us by various existing schools. But, for our present purpose, a limited review will suffice.

Among writers of the neo-scholastic tendency we find considerable divergence regarding the scope of psychology. Mivart makes it as large as possible. "The action of the soul, or psyche, includes every action of the organism, whether plant or animal, of which it is the immaterial constituent, and each action of the kind is a 'psychosis' of one kind or other, there being, of course, vegetal and animal psychoses. The science of psychoses must, of course, be termed 'psychology.'"<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere he says that "psychology, according to its original conception and according to the most rational signification which can be given to the term . . . denotes the study of all the activities, both simultaneous and successive, which any living creature may exhibit."<sup>2</sup> Mercier's definition is less ambitious. For him, "*c'est l'homme seul qui constitue aujourd'hui l'objet de cette partie de la philosophie. Toutefois, si c'est l'homme seul, ce doit être l'homme tout entier, c'est-à-dire, l'homme envisagé dans toutes les manifestations de sa vie.*"<sup>3</sup> Quite consistently with this programme, he devotes several chapters to life in general, beginning with its elementary functions displayed in the cell. More limited still is the plan adopted by Gutberlet, Schneid, Sanseverino, and others, who commence with the description of the sensitive faculty, thus confining psychology to conscious life and its subject. These differences among those who may be regarded as authorities, show us that, within a very wide range, no inflexible boundary can be fixed of which we may properly say: inside of this is psychology, outside of this is something else.

Extremes meet. Six months ago we learned that psychology is "that science of the thinking subject which can be derived from the data furnished by self-consciousness."<sup>4</sup> Here we find the

<sup>1</sup> *On Truth*, London, 1889, p. 427.

<sup>2</sup> *The Cat*, London, 1881, p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> *La Psychologie*, Louvain, 1892. Introd. vi.

<sup>4</sup> CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1894, p. 632.

scope of the science marked off by the use of a particular method. With this first limitation we are not especially concerned, for though self-consciousness in different subjects may furnish conflicting data, and though the process of derivation may issue in opposite conclusions, we freely admit that introspection is essential to psychology. It is the other limitation that claims our attention. The "educated person" for whom this definition is intended, would naturally ask what is meant by the "thinking subject," and to clear up this doubt he is told that the "thinking subject" is man. This is proper, and, moreover, is in keeping with the doctrine of St. Thomas. Besides, it would be hypercritical to remark that man is something more than a "thinking subject"; that he is, for instance, the subject of sensation, emotion and volition. If these activities are not noted in a phrase which is meant to be an equivalent for "man," it is reasonable to suppose that the definition refers to man regarded under one formal aspect, that is to say, inasmuch as he thinks. And thus "psychology" undergoes a contraction.

The summer days having passed, the psychologist finds that he has a larger task, that his science meanwhile has expanded. It now "considers the ultimate causes or constituents of one of the beings in nature, and that the noblest being in all nature—man." If our psychologist has the presence of mind to recall his elements of ontology, he will remember that among these ultimate causes there is quite a variety—causes extrinsic and causes intrinsic, causes efficient and final, material and formal. If he further know what Christian philosophy and revelation teach regarding the causation of man, he may realize the height and breadth and depth of that which he is expected to treat. The efficient cause of man is God, and his final cause or destiny, beatitude. Intrinsically, man is constituted by the matter of his body and by his soul as a formal cause. A science which considers the ultimate causes of man must be a compound of theology, psychology, anatomy and physiology; and the scientist who undertakes the task must be a more wonderful compound still.

The discouraging effects of such a definition must have been foreseen, for it is immediately added, with characteristic consistency, that psychology "treats of man's soul, which is the ultimate constituent principle in him." Here at least the extrinsic causes disappear, and this is a relief. Remembering that there are two ultimate principles in man, one is tempted to suggest that the word "formal" might have been brought into this second definition without spoiling the clearness or the construction. But too much must not be expected. If, after the main difficulties of the first definition have been removed, our psychologist is not able to unravel the rest for himself, his case is hopeless.



From what has been said, it might be inferred that the right to define psychology after this manner is called in question, and that the definitions themselves are hereby declared guilty of logical impiety. The inference, however, is unwarranted. So far as we are aware, there is no legislation to justify such a verdict, and until competent authority take action in the premises, we may as well leave everybody his full liberty. We merely wished to see how far "usage" had settled the scope of psychology, and we have seen. Whatever other charge may be advanced against the modern science of mind, it cannot be accused of violating a copyright when it calls itself "psychology."

We must note, moreover, that there is a reason for the elasticity of this term. The extent of the "logos" depends upon our understanding of the "psyche." If the last-named word be taken in the Aristotelian sense, psychology must treat of the plant-soul and of the brute-soul no less than of the human soul; it must be comparative. If "psyche" is synonymous with "the soul of man," differences naturally arise, according as the soul is understood to be the source of all vital functions in the human organism, or the principle of mental operations or simply the series of conscious states. To adjust these differences, to sift out the erroneous meanings of "soul," and consequently to give "psychology" a definite signification, would certainly be a benefit to the science. But how this is to be accomplished is just now a problem.

Of one thing, however, we may rest assured; the desired adjustment will not be brought about by extremists. As the principal difficulty lies in properly conceiving the union of soul and body, any excess, either in the direction of materialism or on the side of spiritualism, can only obscure the truth and widen out differences of opinion. Hence St. Thomas stigmatizes as *frivola et impossibilia* the views of certain Arabian philosophers, and to refute their arguments, insists that, if the intellect were a substance separate from the organism, no imaginable mode of "continuation" or communication could save the natural unity of man.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, his criticism, though trenchant, did not rid philosophy of this dualism. Revived by Descartes, it has been ever since a prolific source of confusion, not only in the central problem of psychology, but also in the fundamental notions of ontology. Witness the fate of the substance-idea from Spinoza down to the present.

Origen is charged with the parallel error of maintaining that the human soul is specifically the same as the angelic spirit. This exaggeration also St. Thomas refutes by enforcing the doctrine that the soul is the substantial form of the body. Whence he infers,

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Gent.*, l. 2, c. 59.

not only that there is a specific difference between the soul and those "separated substances," but that this difference exceeds that which exists between one angel and another. So great is it, according to him, that neither the immateriality of both nor their final destiny suffices to bring them within the same species.<sup>1</sup>

In view of this explicit teaching, we are somewhat at a loss to know what is meant when we are told concerning the soul that "its world and atmosphere are in the first instance spiritual and abstract essences and individual beings like itself, remote from matter and immortal." If the metaphors could be brushed away from the metaphysics, this passage would present less difficulty. As it is, we must suppose that by the "world and atmosphere" of the soul is understood, in plainer language, the order of its being and activity. Nor can we translate "the first instance" by any other terms than "essentially" or "naturally." If now by "spiritual and abstract essences" we are to understand other souls, the sentence is mere tautology, and simply informs us that the soul belongs naturally to the order of souls. But if these "essences" are angelic substances, we fail to see how they can be called "individual beings like itself." Their individuality is that of a species complete in each of them, each angel being a species unto himself; whereas the soul is said, *minus proprie*, to be an individual being, inasmuch as it is a part of something that is specifically complete. Again, while the angels are naturally "remote from matter," the soul is, by its very nature, united to matter in the closest of bonds; that, namely, which joins matter and form in one substance.

The soul, of course, according to scholastic doctrine, has intellectual operations which prove its superiority to matter; but between the highest activity of the soul and the intellection of the angels there is a specific difference. Nor does the prospect of beatitude, to be shared by angels and men, demonstrate that the world and atmosphere of the soul are separated spirits. This destiny is supernatural, and, consequently, is not a criterion by which similarity, identity, or difference in nature can be ascertained. Figurative expressions, it is true, admit various interpretations, but until less ambiguous terms are employed, we are inclined to think that the world or atmosphere of the soul is, strictly speaking, the organism which it informs.

This excursion into metaphysics has taken us perhaps a little way from the direct line of our exposition. It seemed needful, however, to point out the real teaching of St. Thomas on the sub-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 2, c. 94. Cf. *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 75, a. 7. *Q. Q. Disp.*, *De Anima*, a. 7.

ject, and to show that he repudiates an exaggerated spiritualism from which philosophical thought has so often recoiled, only to fall back upon the opposite extreme. Whatever be the value of his doctrines, historical justice demands that they should be fairly represented. But the demands of prudence are yet more imperative. At a time when Thomistic philosophy is proposed to the world as a remedy for the evils wrought by so many systems, the first care of its advocates should be to speak the genuine language of the school whenever they expound its doctrines. The effort which may be required to reproduce scholastic notions in modern English will bring its own reward. It will prove effectually that the "posthumous glory" of St. Thomas has not waned. It is also a more healthful exercise, morally and mentally, than can be gotten by setting up fictitious antecedents and consequents, in order to shatter them, sequence included, with a volley of denials. And it will go far towards removing those misconceptions which, for three centuries, have robbed the scholastic philosophy of its merits and of its influence.<sup>1</sup>

To conclude: the diversity of opinion which we have pointed out, while it may be regrettable, is nevertheless instructive. First of all, if "psyche" and "psychology" admit such a variety of meanings, equal latitude must be allowed in the choice of psychological methods. So far as usage is concerned, "physiological" and "experimental" are adjectives that have as much right to qualify psychology as "empirical" and "rational." Again, in order that the experimental method may make good its claim for recognition, it is not bound to satisfy every arbitrary definition that may be given to "psychology." Provided it serve psychology understood in a restricted or even an imperfect sense, its rights must be acknowledged. If psychology, for example, be defined as the science of mental phenomena, we may quarrel with the definition and show that it sins by defect. But we cannot, on this ground, condemn as unpsychological a method which, within this limited scope, is used to good purpose. Finally, and *a fortiori*, we

<sup>1</sup> We did not state that the scholastic philosophy about the soul is "effete," and much less that it "passed out of existence somewhere in the sixteenth century." We suspect, however, that something must have happened to it about that time, for, according to the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, the downfall of philosophy coincided with the so called Reformation. "In veteris doctrinae locum nova quaedam philosophiae ratio hac illac successit. . . . Hoc autem novitatis studium, cum homines imitatione trahantur, Catholicorum quoque philosophorum animos visum est alicubi pervasisse; qui patrimonio antiquae sapientiae posthabito, nova moliri, quam vetera novis augere et perficere maluerunt, certe minus sapienti consilio, et non sine scientiarum detrimento." As a consequence, "optimo itaque consilio cultores disciplinarum philosophicarum non pauci, cum ad *instaurandam* utiliter philosophiam *novissime* animum adjecerint, praeclaram Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam *restituere*, atque in pristinum decus vindicare studuerunt et student." The italics are ours.

are not justified in rejecting the experimental method because it leaves untouched those deeper problems which can be approached only by metaphysical reasoning. We might as well denounce arithmetic for not handling the questions that belong to trigonometry. The business of experiment is to furnish accurate data regarding mental processes; it has nothing to do with ultimate causes directly. But a psychologist who takes no account of these data, is as much to be commended as a boy who takes up trigonometry without knowing the rules of arithmetic. Hence we infer that the experimental method comes within the scope of psychology; more especially that it pertains to empirical psychology, and that, within the range of empirical psychology, it calls to its aid such means of investigation as are offered by physics and physiology. Neither usage nor etymology restrains us from accepting this inference, so that if, in other respects, the method be legitimate, its employment is not only permissible but necessary also for every psychologist who believes that the workings of mind deserve thorough investigation.

## II.

That this condition is fulfilled might easily be shown by an appeal to facts, were it not that, at this point, an injunction is apparently placed on the whole proceeding. For it is urged that the new psychology is inoculated with philosophical error; that it teems with materialism, idealism, and all the other isms whereto the mind of man is prone. And if this saying be true, further argument on the matter is vain. On the other hand, we may be reminded that the scholastic authors hereinbefore cited, though they differ as to the comprehensiveness of the term "psyche," do nevertheless aver, each abounding in his own sense, that psychology is the science of the soul. Wherefore it may appear that, the soul being out of the reach of experiment, psychology is averse to the experimental method. There is, of course, nothing new about these difficulties, and, consequently, for well-informed persons the reply must be obvious. We have only to present here, in a certain order, the lines of distinction that suggest themselves to every reader of this REVIEW.

We note then that, in questions of this kind, it is not allowable to identify science with any scientist or with any particular school. A science is to be judged by its methods and by the data with which it enriches our knowledge. The interpretations put upon such results are worth no more and no less than the reasoning which supports them, and which can easily be tested by honest criticism. This is true even where deduction does not overstep the limits of the science in which research has been conducted. From an im-

portant discovery in optics, a physicist may deduce and maintain an erroneous hypothesis concerning the nature of light. Stahl, after rendering inestimable service to chemistry by distinguishing elements from compounds, erred in his conception of "phlogiston" as the principle of combustion; and the error was followed, in spite of Lavoisier's brilliant refutation, by chemists of the highest rank like Priestley and Scheele. It is one thing to get at facts by observation or experiment, and another to explain them, to point out their bearings and to generalize their meaning. If the deduction is correct, so much the better for its author and for science. If it is faulty, it will sooner or later be discarded; but the facts which suggested it and the merit of their discoverer will remain.

Conclusions that extend beyond the confines of a science have greater need of vigorous control. Apart from the evils of "hasty generalization," mistakes may occur through neglect of the data supplied by other sciences. False philosophical assumptions may vitiate a demonstration which otherwise is sanctioned by logic. And scientists sometimes exult in the assurance that they have demolished a "dogma," when, in reality, they have only upset a conception of their untheological fancy. In all such cases we have a right to challenge conclusions, but the scientific data must be retained, and credit must be given to the men who brought them together.

When, however, we are obliged to reject the views of individual thinkers, we are not thereby authorized to brand the science itself as erroneous. Some astronomers do not believe in the existence of God; does it follow that astronomy is atheistic? Some philosophers hold that God is the Unknowable; does this prove that philosophy is agnostic? And because many modern interpreters of Scripture are of the rationalistic school, are we to conclude that exegesis and rationalism are one and the same? With equal justice we might infer, from the numerous cases of Daltonism, that vision in general is delusive and color-perception a snare. We do not accept these absurd conclusions for the obvious reason that no science is locked up in the brain of any one scientist as his exclusive property, while we know, on the contrary, that in all these branches orthodox thinkers are at work.

The same holds good of experimental psychology. The question of its materialism, idealism, or spiritualism is quite independent of individual opinion regarding the nature of mind. Such opinion may be aprioristic, the result of philosophical bias; or it may, though arrived at by original unprejudiced thinking, rest on defective reasoning. The blame in this case attaches, not to the empirical research, but to the metaphysics of the individual. A

man may be a Newton at experiment and yet cut a sorry figure as a metaphysician. And it is no less certain that minds habituated to metaphysical subtleties may err in their appreciation of empirical data.

To apply this criterion, let us suppose that psychologists are in perfect harmony; that they are all thorough-going spiritualists and ardent scholastics. Are we warranted in saying that experimental psychology is fragrant with spiritualism? Not in the least. Grati-fying as it may be to have all the elements of truth, empirical and speculative, fitted into a system, the spiritualism lies, not in the obtaining of results by experimental methods, but in giving those results a meaning concordant with the principles of spiritualistic philosophy.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that all psychologists of the modern school are out-and-out materialists, idealists, or skeptics. Does it follow that experimental psychology is "reeking" with any of their isms? By no means. The only permissible conclusion is that a certain number of people, imbued with a certain sort of philosophy, are shrewd enough to seize upon every scrap of truth furnished by experiment and make it appear that theirs is the only logical interpretation.

But now, hypotheses aside, we find that no such harmony exists; that a great variety of philosophies is found among those who uphold experimental psychology; and that, in spite of these differences, the science is fairly progressing. Under these circumstances, it must be clear that neither an array of eminent names nor a long list of quotations can help us to determine the philosophical value of experimental methods. The spiritualist, no doubt, might derive consolation from passages like this: "Were the mechanism of the brain-processes with which an individual soul-life is connected, ever so clearly exposed to our view in every detail, all that we would get would be a highly complex arrangement of molecular movements. As to the psychical import of these processes, we would learn nothing. They might just as well belong to a lifeless mechanism as to the physiological basis of consciousness."<sup>1</sup> He might also read with pleasure a modern refutation of the "Mind-Stuff Theory";<sup>2</sup> and it surely would not grieve him to find a recent author proving the existence and unity of a supra-organic soul.<sup>3</sup> But, *quid inde?* Just as many authors might be cited on the other side, while in the writings of one and

---

<sup>1</sup> Wundt, *System der Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1889, s. 583. Cf. Du Bois-Reymond, *Ueber die Grenzen des Naturerkennens*, Leipzig, 1872, s. 17, 25. Huxley, "Science and Morals," in *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1886.

<sup>2</sup> James, *Principles of Psychology*, vol. i., p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> Ladd, *Elements of Physiological Psychology*, New York, 1891, part iii.

the same author contradiction, apparent or real, could be detected. Such a compilation would only puzzle the compiler. He might, of course, count the authorities on one side and on the other, and conclude that materialism is so many per cent. in advance. But this would be a trick of statistics, showing a good deal about psychologists and nothing about psychology itself. Except for pointing out differences of opinion, as was done a few pages back, citation in this connection is worthless.

Let it be granted at once that some psychologists have gone astray in their philosophical deductions. We may criticize and cast aside their conclusions, but the error which these contain does not destroy the facts from which they are drawn. We are far, of course, from maintaining that every statement of "fact," or every account of investigation, is infallible. When a psychologist has earned a reputation for thoroughness and precision, we take up his publication with a degree of confidence which we might withhold from another in whom these qualities are wanting. But favorably disposed as we may be, we do not credit an author's statements simply because they are his. His experiments can be repeated, his methods examined, and possibilities of error discovered which may have escaped his scrutiny. If he calls attention to a mental peculiarity hitherto unnoticed, or enters into a field before unoccupied, the credit which must be given him as a pioneer does not vouch for his explanations.

In the same spirit those generalizations are to be treated which, within the bounds of empirical psychology, tend more and more to become laws and guiding principles of the science. A man who has grown familiar by personal research with the whole domain of psychology and with its kindred branches, deserves a hearing when he advances a synthetic view. But our respect for him does not prevent us from thinking for ourselves, nor enroll us, despite our better judgment, in his "school." In other words, authority, be it ever so weighty, is neither a source of argument nor a final criterion in modern psychology. Much less has the "modern school" delegated any individual or body of individuals, to go before the thinking world and make a profession of philosophic faith in the name of the new psychology.

Whoever is conversant with psychological literature understands the real situation. Scarcely a piece of work has been done in the last three decades which has not received vigorous, though straightforward criticism. Not an hypothesis, however ingenious, has been advanced without calling forth discussion; and no theory, however well supported, has passed unchallenged into general acceptance. This we understand if we keep in mind the nature of scientific progress, and especially the vicissitudes through which

a new science must pass before it issues from the cradle stage. But at the same time this independence of research in regard to details that might seem trivial, is an evidence that no one psychologist is having it all his own way, and moulding the science immutably upon his opinions. It is also sufficient proof to fair-minded people that psychology is not committed to any tendency that would finally plunge it into philosophical error.

A recent statement, brought forth after some labor of demonstration, informs us that "the question of the soul itself, therefore, is altogether philosophical, or, as Aristotle puts it, is 'metaphysical,' that is, 'after physics,' behind it, beyond it, belonging to the ultimate causes of things." There is more pith than pertinence in this remark. As an admonition to modern psychology it is, to say the least, superfluous. If the new Czar, in his first official communication, were to inform the Powers that Siberia being after, behind, and beyond the Ural Mountains is a portion of Asia, and were further to enforce this declaration with manifold proofs, the mildest comment in diplomatic circles would be a smile. And a similar comment will light up the faces of psychologists when they are told, for their correction, that the question of the soul itself is metaphysical. If there is one point on which they are nearly unanimous it is this: they declare, implicitly or explicitly, that the nature of the soul is beyond the range of empirical research. Any attempt to convince them of this, is after and behind the actual state of the science.

For this very reason experimental psychology occupies a neutral position. *Per se*, it is neither monistic nor dualistic, neither materialistic nor spiritualistic. Any system that pretends to define the ultimate subject of mental processes is philosophical. It is based on the principle that every operation must proceed from a substance. What is this substance? "The brain," says one; the "immaterial soul," says the other. These are the ultimate terms of opposite deductions. But evidently, in order that either may be reached, a certain preparation is necessary. The materialist, with one end in view, strives to show that all mental phenomena are essentially organic; the spiritualist, aiming at a different conclusion, insists upon the distinction between lower and higher operations. Experimental psychology, however, leans neither to one side nor to the other. Its postulates are as independent of materialism as they are of spiritualism; it does not undertake to say what the soul is or what it is not.

How, then, can the new science style itself "psychology" at all? To vindicate such a claim it ought certainly to tell us something about the psyche. But if it eschews the "question of the soul itself," what addition can it make to our knowledge of mind?



This question is easily answered if certain elementary notions are presupposed. Neither a dictionary nor a treatise on epistemology is needed to convince the average mind that there are many ways of "knowing" a thing. Much less will such a mind, honesty taken for granted, infer that knowledge of one sort implies knowledge of every sort concerning the same object. Who does not know what air is? And yet comparatively few are aware that it is a mixture of oxygen and nitrogen. Who does not know what life is? Yet the deepest thinker may be puzzled for its definition. Who has not felt pain and pleasure, love, anger, pity and fear? But ask for an analysis of these emotions and see how often the answer will be correct. Indeed, there is no end to the list of these common *Erlebnisse*, which in a sense are known and in another sense are unknown. To know, that is, to have experience of, such facts is not only easy but is, in many cases, unavoidable. To know, that is, to understand and scientifically to account for, our daily experiences, is not only difficult but is, in some cases, impossible.

Considerations like these may have suggested to St. Thomas the important distinction which he uses in discussing the knowledge which the soul may have of itself. The mere perception of his conscious states tells each man that he has a soul, and therefore responds, by a sort of experiential knowledge, to the question, *an anima sit*. But to answer the question, *quid anima sit*, to define the soul's nature in terms of universal and scientific import, a thorough examination of its acts is needed.<sup>1</sup>

The same distinction applies, of course, to the knowledge of the acts themselves. Every one knows by experience what it is to see, to hear, to imagine, to remember, to hesitate, to decide. But not every one is prepared to tell us in what these several processes consist. Thus when we are asked, "Who does not know what attention is?" we can only reply, that depends. If "knowing" means simply acquaintance by experience, we take it that most adults, in possession of their faculties, know what attention is. But if a precise knowledge as to the nature of attention be called for, we shall seek it in vain from the majority of people. "It means the application of the mind voluntarily and freely, or that of any sense, to one object in preference to others, and with more energy than is required for a cursory glance or perception." At first sight we are uncertain whether the adverbs "voluntarily and freely" are meant to include the "application" of the senses; but the doubt is removed by the sentence which immediately follows. "It implies an effort proceeding from a desire of the free will to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 87, a. 1.

know." From this general statement we infer that attention, in all cases, is a free and voluntary application.

The principal merit of this definition is the facility with which it can be verified. We know, for instance, how "freely and voluntarily" we turn our attention when our neighbor slams his door emphatically, when a drop of melting wax falls from our candle upon our unexpectant hand, and when, in the street-car, our toes receive the weight of a careless fellow-passenger. We recall the eager desire of our "free will to know" in virtue of which we have managed, at sundry times, to attend to a toothache. And no Christian, of course, will henceforward dare to excuse his distractions in prayer on the plea that such wanderings of the attention are, or may have been, involuntary. In a word, nothing engages our attention, unless our free will expressly ordain. This exquisite psychology may suit beings that dwell in the world and atmosphere of ideal perfection. But lest ordinary mortals should become scrupulous or discouraged, we must remind them that modern psychology, with all its waywardness, distinguishes two sorts of attention, one of which is determined by the force of outer impressions, the vividness of a mental image or the absorbing power of an idea; and another in which the will exercises control.<sup>1</sup> With this distinction to guide him the reader may see how complete is the definition which we have just examined. By a strange unselfish oversight it was brought in directly after the question, "Who does not know what attention is?" Remarks that follow in the same paragraph prompt us to ask, Who, with any scientific training, does not know the difference between defining attention, or any other process, and describing the conditions on which it depends? The new psychology has not discovered attention, but it has shown up some features in the process which are well worth studying before a definition is attempted.

Supposing, now, that we desire a scientific knowledge of any mental activity, we see at once that some method must be followed. As in the natural sciences, random investigation is fruitless, so with much greater reason must psychology be a failure if it is not properly directed. And, as in those sciences which study things of the outer world, observation and experiment are used, so for the study of consciousness we are offered two methods—the introspective and the experimental. It was stated, however, in our former article, that experiment, far from setting introspection aside, necessarily includes it and renders it more perfect. The choice, therefore, is not between introspection alone and experiment alone, but between introspection alone and introspection

---

<sup>1</sup> The same distinction is pointed out by Michael Maher, S.J., in his *Psychology*, London, 189c, p. 332.

controlled by experiment. If, having thus to choose, we listen to certain critics, we must banish experiment entirely, because, as they are pleased to imagine, it implies materialism, idealism and all else that is not scholasticism. How do they know this? From the fact that among those who employ the experimental method some are materialists, idealists and the like. But what about those who, during twenty centuries and more, have relied on introspection alone? Were there and are there no materialists and idealists among them? Were these errors born in 1860, when Fechner's "Psychophysik" appeared? We venture to say that there is to-day just as much false philosophy concerning the soul among those who reject experimental psychology, as there is among those who are its promoters. And we therefore conclude that, if experiment is to be condemned on the ground assigned by such critics, pure introspection must also be repudiated. After that, what becomes of psychological method? We prefer to think that the choice is still open.

The critics think otherwise. They warn us, in every tone of the menacing scale, that the soul cannot be weighed and measured, seared with acids, spanned with compasses or twitched with electrodes. Really! The critics, of course, are fully aware that no such nonsense as this ever entered the mind of a psychologist. But it serves their purpose to pretend that danger is near and stoutly to battle with shadows. Out of a popular misconception they forge an argument against modern psychology, and with this weapon stand forth as champions of sound philosophy. But the alarm is groundless and the defense quite needless. There will be time enough for such protests when once it is proved that any adherent of the modern school is tampering, or trying to tamper, with the immaterial soul. And if, meanwhile, there be any intelligent person who would like to see for himself how experimental research is conducted, but is held back through fear of *psychalgia*, we are certain that the director of any laboratory in the land will gladly warrant such an inquirer perfect immunity, and receive him as an interesting subject.

Then the new psychology excludes the soul altogether, or, to use Dr. Ward's energetic expression, it is a "psychology without even consciousness."<sup>1</sup> Once a charge has been made, it must be sustained, and anything will do for the purpose. First, it is insinuated that experimental psychology is torturing, or trying to torture, the soul; then it is urged that the new science acknowledges neither soul nor consciousness. But the truth of the matter is simple enough. Experimental research, properly speaking,

---

<sup>1</sup> "Modern Psychology; a Reflection," in *Mind*, January, 1893.

neither includes nor excludes the soul, because it is occupied with the phenomena of mind. Here, again, it is on the same level with introspection. Self-observation, however long and thorough, does not, of itself, reach down to an underlying substance. When introspection has furnished sufficient data concerning our mental activities, we may, if we choose, proceed by reasoning to establish the existence of a soul and to demonstrate its peculiar nature. Similarly, when by experimental methods we have gained a more accurate knowledge of conscious phenomena, we are free to argue, with the aid of philosophical principles, that such operations must have such a subject, and that the union between body and soul must be of this or that character. But in its proper scope experiment does not, any more than does introspection, carry us directly to the essential source of psychical processes. If, in this respect, it is guilty and must be abandoned, the same sentence falls logically on the introspective method.

But even as confined to its own sphere, is the experimental method legitimate? In other words, can we, without materialistic implication, speak of experimenting on mental phenomena? As this doubt brings us to the core of the question, we may be pardoned for briefly referring to "rudiments." Let us see, first of all, what we mean by experiment. Through a circular opening in the shutter a beam of light enters the room, is intercepted by a prism, and spreads in spectral colors on the opposite wall. We observe that the spectrum is not round like the aperture but has the form of a band, and we seek the reason of this difference. The opening is enlarged, and the phenomenon persists. The prism is placed outside the shutter, and the same effect is produced. But when each of the colored rays is separately passed through a second prism, different degrees of refraction are noticed which account for the position of the colors in the spectrum. In thus varying the conditions of a phenomenon so as to single out its cause, we are said to experiment.

Can we, without becoming materialists, vary the conditions of mental activity, note the effect of each variation, and hence determine what causes are at work? In a certain measure, we are all more or less given to psychological experiment. Who has not at one time or another, brought various images and ideas into his mind and observed the consequent flow of emotion? Self-knowledge, again, supposes an accurate estimate of the tests to which we are daily subjected, and the best of people find out by frequent trial that certain considerations are more powerful incentives to right-doing than others. The range of such *internal* experiment is narrow, and fully to master it, no mean power of concentration is required. But in practical life experiment upon others is

constantly practiced. To say nothing of the orator who plays upon every chord of feeling, most people know how to pass from threat to flattery and from this to the hope of reward, when dealing with one from whom they expect a service. Skill in managing these psychological conditions, is the secret of success in the school-room, the pulpit and the diplomatic circle. Is there any materialism in this sort of experiment?

It is on the same principle that experiment, in the stricter sense of the term, proceeds. The only difference is that, for the sake of scientific accuracy, we are obliged to isolate as far as possible the mental phenomena which we study, to place our subject in the most favorable circumstances, and to vary the conditions by fine gradations which in some cases necessitate nice apparatus. If there is no materialism in observing conscious changes which we produce in ourselves, there can certainly be none in observing and making known the effect upon our consciousness of impressions produced and controlled by somebody else. But if this be admitted, it must also be clear that there is no materialism in comparing subjective estimates with the objective stimuli or stimuli-differences to which those estimates refer.

It is a fact of experience that the same interval of time seems longer or shorter according to the way in which it is filled. Any one can test this datum in various ways—by spending an hour at mathematics, another with a novel, a third in pleasant conversation and a fourth with the headache. But suppose that a person desires to know what his estimate of duration is, apart from these occupations or experiences. Sitting quietly in his chair and thinking only of time as it lapses, he readily distinguishes between one interval of two minutes and another of five. Yet in this case his attention, under an excessive strain, fluctuates, and he is obliged to select smaller intervals within which it is fairly constant, such as seconds and fractions of seconds. As, moreover, his watch, besides the distraction and loss of time involved in looking at it when the intervals end or begin, does not give him clear-cut, empty intervals, he arranges a series of signal taps which can be spaced at will and be automatically sounded. But again, so long as he fixes the intervals for himself, he knows beforehand their respective lengths and in consequence his judgment is not without bias. To avoid this difficulty, he gets a friend to take charge of the signals, while he, without knowing in advance either the interval lengths or the order in which they are to be presented, has simply to give them his attention, and declare whether the first or second seem longer. His judgments are then compared with the actual intervals, and are found to be more or less accurate.

A gradual transition, each step of which is enforced by the na-

ture of the problem, thus leads from the observation of a familiar fact to the extremely delicate research, whose results converge upon what is known as the "time-sense." If any one will kindly point out in this transition from introspection to experiment, a phase that is tainted with materialism, idealism, or theological impiety, we will be grateful. And yet in all the work of modern psychology there is no more typical experiment than the one we have just described. We conclude that so far as the essentials of the experimental method are concerned, it may be as properly applied to mental phenomena as to those of the physical order.

It is urged, however, that certain forms of experiment tacitly imply that mental activity is a material something. We hear a good deal nowadays about "psychical measurement" and "quantitative results" in psychology. Can anything be measured that is not material, and can there be a "psychometry" that is not materialistic? The objection is specious; but it crumbles the moment we remember that magnitude does not necessarily mean extension. There is a magnitude of intensity and another of velocity. Nobody claims that mental processes are measurable because they are extended; but it is claimed that they have an intensity and a time-rate which can be measured. In determining the latter we do not assume that the mind moves through a given space in the unit of time; this would savor of materialism, or rather of foolishness. What we say is that the mental process endures while a physical object passes through a certain space, while the hand of a chronoscope, for instance, travels over a part of the dial. In measuring the intensity of psychical acts, we do not compare them with a physical unit like the centimeter or gramme. We compare one sensation, for example, with another, and then compare our estimate of their equality or difference, with the variations of the external stimuli.

It cannot be denied that our mental processes have a duration, whether this be called with St. Augustine *tempus*, or, with St. Thomas, *vicissitudo quaedam intelligibilium operationum*. It is certain, also, that our sensations, emotions and volitions have various degrees of intensity. Have we not been told in the definition, which we considered a few pages back, that attention is "the application of the mind . . . with *more energy*<sup>1</sup> than is required for a cursory glance or perception?" But if there is no materialism in admitting that mental processes have a strength and a speed of their own, there can be no materialism in comparing these magnitudes, after the manner above described, with magnitudes in the physical order. Difficulties there doubtless are, and numerous

---

<sup>1</sup> Italics ours.

sources of technical error. These were sufficiently indicated in the July number of this REVIEW, along with the methods by which they are obviated. But the principle itself, viz., that psychical acts can be measured, admits of no question.<sup>1</sup>

These notions sufficiently show that, in order to determine the intensity of sensations, it is not necessary to suppose that they consist "of motions running up to the brain and down again," nor to admit that in the hands of experimental psychology, "sensation becomes a question of mere molecular physics, a form of motion, vibration, extension." The integrity of the nervous system from the peripheral organs to the centre is a *conditio sine qua non* of external sensation. Many peculiarities of sensation are in direct dependence upon the laws which govern neural transmission. And this is what we should naturally expect, if, as scholastic philosophy teaches, sensation is a function, not of the soul alone nor of the body alone, but of the body-soul composite. But to establish such relations is by no means the same as to identify sensation and nerve-current. Much less is it equivalent to saying that sensation is an affair of molecular physics, for, except by means of slender hypothesis, the ultimate nature of neural transmission is unknown. Were it shown conclusively that stimulation travels along the nerves by chemico-mechanical processes, this would not imply that the resulting conscious phenomena are simply the vibrations or combinations of material particles. And so far as the possibility or value of psychological experiment is in question, it matters little what physiologists hold regarding the final processes that take place in fibres, ganglia, and gray matter.

The proof of this statement is furnished by the much-abused and, in some cases, little understood psycho-physical methods. Whoever will take the trouble to study these methods, instead of trying to besmirch them with Kantism or Hegelianism, will see that they are essentially based upon the conscious nature of sensation as distinct from mere nerve-function. They are, in fact, nothing more nor less than a systematic comparison of subjective estimates and objective stimulation. They can be applied without so much as a reference to nervous tissue and molecular motions. And if, for the interpretation of results, physiological considerations are helpful, these do not reduce sensation to mere molecular impact. On the contrary, by sifting out the unconscious elements in an intricate process, they set forth in stronger relief the conscious factor which is sensation.

That physiology and psychology are in contact at many points,

<sup>1</sup> Other difficulties are ably answered by Gutberlet, "Ueber Messbarkeit psychischer Acte," in the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (Fulda). V. Bd. (1892), s. 42 ff. and VII. Bd. (1894), s. 381 ff.

is too obvious for denial. But it does not follow that, even in the study of sensation, the former science can supplant the latter. Physiology, proceeding by external observation, regards the nervous system as a mechanism in which transformations and redistributions of organic matter and organic energy take place in accordance with physical and chemical laws. Introspective psychology, based on internal observation, deals immediately with facts of consciousness. Between conscious states and nerve-processes there is a correlation of some kind, and it is this correlation that physiological psychology investigates. Thus combining the researches of two sciences, it must partake also of their methods. From physiology it receives numerous and invaluable data, by which it is directed in the work of experiment and especially in the application of external stimuli. On the other hand, physiology must confess that its own explorations are far from being perfect. It has not penetrated those brain recesses in which the immediate physical antecedents or consequents of mental processes are hidden. Hence we are obliged, as a rule, to consider the more remote causes of such processes, namely, the physical agencies that impress our peripheral organs of sense, and to compare their qualitative and quantitative variations with the corresponding changes in consciousness. For the orderly carrying out of this comparison, psycho-physical methods have been devised, in which, as was already noted, the principal stress is laid upon the peculiarities of our subjective estimate.

From this point of view it is possible to answer a query that has recently, with more or less wisdom, been propounded. Of Weber's law it is said: "This acute inference means that when we compare we compare; that we feel one impression, say of heat, to be stronger than another; but we do not forthwith know that the hotter object is precisely 95° F., and the cooler object just 70° F. . . . The estimate we form of this profound conclusion is, What has it to do with psychology except to call attention to a circumstance of sense which was perfectly well known?"

Let us see. The value of a conclusion depends upon the value of its antecedents, and, in this particular case, upon the value of a comparison made between two sensations. Now, to begin with, scholastic writers consider the ability to compare sensations as evidence that man is endowed with supra-sensuous powers. This argument they adduce in works on "psychology."<sup>1</sup> Secondly, every such comparison involves the perception of a relation and a judgment, and these operations may possibly concern psychology. Thirdly, the discernment of a difference between the stimuli sup-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Michael Maher, S.J., *op. cit.*, p. 237.



poses a concentration of the attention which is greater in proportion as the difference decreases. And attention, we have been told, is an application of the mind, an effort of the free will with a desire to know. Perhaps the psychologist might find something in this. Fourthly, the various deliveries of consciousness, in the course of such a comparison, include the ideas of identity and non-identity, inasmuch as the experimentee has to say when the two sensations appear to be the same and when they appear to be different. But these ideas, we should think, are not altogether foreign to psychology. Fifthly, the outcome of this and many other comparisons is that the character of each conscious state is determined in great measure by contiguous states; in other words, that it conforms to the "law of relativity." Here, at any rate, psychology has something to say. Sixthly, it being our turn now to ask a question, we should like to know what right any one has to say that this comparison, with all the processes involved, is a "circumstance of sense?"

Weber's inference was, perhaps, too "acute," for it means something more than "that when we compare we compare." It means that in consciousness there is an activity which cannot be resolved into a phase of physical energy, and a causality which is not identical with that whereby material effects are produced. Whether this meaning is of interest to psychology, others may decide. We merely wish to observe that the criticism just quoted betrays a slight misapprehension. In psychological experiment the subject is not required to know, either "forthwith" or later on, the physical intensity of the stimuli which he judges. He is not asked to guess at thermometer readings when he estimates two impressions of heat. He has only to say when the impressions appear to be equal and when they appear to differ. Comparing afterwards his judgments with corresponding intervals on the thermometer, we get a measure for his sensibility and for his power of discrimination. This power would be rather low if 25° F. in objective temperature just sufficed to produce a subjective difference, not because the subject failed to recognize one stimulus as being at 70° F. and the other as being at 95° F., but because 25° is so large an increment relatively to 70°, the first term of the comparison. We conclude that Weber's little inference contained some "circumstances" that were not "perfectly well known," if "perfectly" be synonymous with "universally."

Similar questions have been asked by critics and might be answered here in detail, were it at all probable that their purpose is to get information. But they are mostly rhetorical forms of the charge which is baldly put in the assertion, that "the study of physiological psychology leads to materialism." The "leading"

may consist in a philosophical deduction from experimental results, and in this theoretical aspect the accusation has been sufficiently repelled. Or again,—and more likely,—it is meant that the study leads to materialism by its practical effects, by tying down the mind to researches with apparatus of brass and steel and other hard metals, by compelling an exact knowledge of mental processes, and by subjecting these to all sorts of tests, modifications and measurements. Therefore, physiological psychology must be condemned, its study classed among the black arts and its haunts avoided by all right-minded people.

Let us apply the same argument to other lines of research. The study of medicine leads to materialism. The study of the Bible leads to heresy and rationalism. And the study of almost any branch leads to insanity. Therefore, medicine, Scripture and science in general are to be shunned by the righteous. Whoever relishes the latter conclusion is welcome, so far as we are concerned, to accept the former. But intelligent persons, we think, will perceive that the two conclusions are equally absurd and for identical reasons. Should some folk become materialists after studying experimental psychology, the trouble is with the students and not with the study, with their lack of logic and not with the principles of research. "But no amount of experimentation on the things of nature or on ourselves need make us mere experimentalists or empiricists, who will accept only that which is tested by physical experiment or is observed by the physiologist's eye." Precisely; the idea could not have been more cleverly expressed. But why write this on one page and on another endorse the statement that the study of physiological psychology leads to materialism? Physiological psychology has enough to do investigating mental phenomena and discovering their relations and proximate causes. Whether there is something beneath or beyond or behind those phenomena, is a question that it very properly leaves to metaphysics. Let us suppose that such speculations ensnare illogical minds in materialism. We shall presently see that this is an additional motive, not for rejecting the experimental method, but for accepting it and turning it to better account.<sup>1</sup>

Before approaching this phase of the subject we may add a

<sup>1</sup> Some recent criticisms are noteworthy if only for their *naïveté*. Among the papers presented at the Catholic Scientific Congress held in Paris (1891), was one on physiological psychology by the Abbé Maisonneuve. Near the close of his article he says that "la psychologie physiologique se trompe ou nous trompe . . . quand elle se défend d'être spiritualiste ou matérialiste. . . . Elle aurait pu, elle devrait être un auxiliaire; elle est un ennemi." And then, forgetfully, he adds an exhortation: "Faisons, nous aussi, de la psychologie positive, pratiquons la méthode expérimentale, interrogeons les faits." See the *Compte Rendu*, 3d section, p. 153.

word in reply to the incidental charge of idealism. This has been already answered in a general way by showing that it would hold good against the introspective method also. Here we must recall a distinction, often overlooked, between two lines of research. What is the nature of mental processes, and how are they related or conditioned? This is the problem that psychology has to solve. Is there, outside of the mind and independent of its action, a reality of which those processes are true representations? This question is answered by the theory of knowledge. Any doctrine—idealism, subjectivism, or phenomenalism—that answers it negatively, denying objective reality, is open, of course, to philosophical criticism. But such criticism does not affect experimental psychology, for the simple reason that it assumes the objective reality of those agencies which it employs to vary the conditions of mental operation. On this assumption the comparisons of which we have spoken are based, and if they prove that subjective estimates differ to some extent from physical relations, they do not destroy the reality of external stimuli.

We conclude that the experimental method is free both from idealism and from materialism, and that consequently it is as legitimate in this respect as the method of introspection.

### III.

Hitherto we have dealt with the theoretical bearings of experimental psychology; we have now to take a practical view of it or rather of the relations in which it stands to a given philosophy, that is, to the philosophy of spiritualism.

It is possible, we admit, for some spiritualists to close their eyes in a sublime indifference to what the busy thinking world around them is doing. If they are apathetic in the practical matter of pedagogics, what may we expect of them in regard to the scientific foundations of pedagogics which are laid in psychology? "The final object of all education belongs to the sphere of pure psychology; it is the cultivation of the spiritual and immortal soul." We have read one or two treatises of the purest psychology without finding anything about education. What is meant, we suppose, is that pedagogics must keep in view certain truths established by pure psychology, such as the soul's spirituality and immortality. "Catholics understand this well enough. So well, indeed, do they understand it, made known to them by the light of natural good sense, and still more revealed to them by the light of divine faith which is in them, that they sit by uninterested and apathetic, while the world is agitated with a fever of 'educational thinking,' of 'pedagogic inquiry,' of investigation, groping for what children of the Church possess by a divine birthright." After this remarkable

admission there is added, strangely enough, a plaint. "And just as in fields of religious inquiry so in this matter, too, they are considered to be backward, to be behind the times, indolent and unenterprising, because, forsooth, they do not go about with a candle looking for some bits of truth when they have the whole of it to look at in the light of noonday."

Of late we have heard Catholics frequently accused on this score; but it is the first time that we have seen the accusation answered by a printed declaration to the effect that Catholics sit by, uninterested and apathetic, while the world is busy with questions of education. Nor is their sedentary habit in keeping with logic; for though they may know ever so clearly what the object of all education is, it does not necessarily follow that they know all about the means by which that object is to be attained. To get possession of these means, a mode of activity incompatible with the sitting position might be necessary.

Apart from these little oversights, the statement is rather interesting as a comment upon those conciliar decrees which enact that Catholic schools should be on a level, *institutione ac disciplina*, with other schools, which provide for the examination of teachers and insist upon the opening of normal schools.<sup>1</sup> If those who formulated such decrees are "uninterested and apathetic," they certainly took a singular way of showing their indifference.

The practical consequences of the statement could not have been fully foreseen. Among Catholic boys who enter Catholic colleges, there are some whose love of study is not all-absorbing, and who will probably rejoice to know that they can dispense with the candle and the groping after bits of truth. But others, with the curiosity of youth, may ask what the diploma means which they receive after four years spent in contemplating the whole truth. And others still, being perversely inclined, may wonder why they should go to college at all, when they have a "divine birthright" to the fulness of knowledge.

There is another consequence of the statement, which we hope was also unintended. It acts as an intellectual opiate upon such Catholics, parents and scholars, as are agitated by a fever of thinking, educational or otherwise, and imagine deliriously that the schools which they patronize ought to be as ready to advance and improve their methods as are other institutions. This unrest being hypnotized into apathy, it is not difficult to give the patients any number of suggestions, hallucinations included, as to the baneful results of psychology, inquiry, and investigation. We do not envy this mental condition nor dispute the birthright, human or

---

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Plen. Balt. III., 197, 203, 205.

divine, of any one; but we heartily wish that some one who has the whole truth in regard to psychology would divide, and save us the trouble of groping for bits. Until this be done, we must content ourselves with the candle-search, or, as St. Thomas calls it, the *subtilis et diligens inquisitio*.<sup>1</sup>

It is unnecessary to argue that Catholic philosophers should not be apathetic concerning experimental psychology, because, as a matter of fact, the foremost among them have shown their interest. But how far ought this interest to go? It is something, at least, to find in scholastic manuals that their authors are in touch with the modern movement. Still more satisfactory is it when a writer analyzes experimental results, criticises the method by which they are obtained, intercepts the erroneous conclusion which they might seem to support, and gives their true interpretation. Writers of this class are too prudent to condemn *a priori* a course of research which, though conducted by materialists, may furnish facts in support of spiritualistic philosophy. And they know that in scientific criticism the anathema is of little avail. If the new psychology needs correction, as all its advocates admit, this can be applied honestly and effectually by any one who will study its methods. Weber's law has been modified, and, what is more, the modification will continue until a satisfactory formula is obtained. But the work of correction will be accomplished by painstaking research and decent criticism, not by angry accusations of formal error in Christian belief.<sup>2</sup>

It is not enough, however, that the advocates of spiritualism should appreciate the modern movement and give it their critical attention. A proper understanding of their own interests obliges them to take a more active part. The experimental method is unquestionably scientific, and the Church is undoubtedly the friend

<sup>1</sup> There are, nevertheless, some bright features in the statement to which we refer. First, it frees us from the necessity of upholding modern pedagogics, since no argument can avail where apathy is set up as a principle. Secondly, it shines by contrast, not only with the progressive educational measures of the Holy See, but also with the views of those who are on a nearer level. In the October number of the *Études Religieuses*, published by the Jesuit Fathers in Paris, an article by the Père L. Roure is worth reading. After showing that the results obtained by the modern study of the child-mind are in harmony with Thomistic philosophy, he adds: "The early education of the child must follow this evolution and be gradually modified with the varying phases of this evolution; it is seldom that the most abstract theories have no bearing upon practical life." In other words, according to this writer, the bits of truth which pedagogy may gather from modern psychology, are worthy of consideration. For a summary of the article, see *The Catholic Times* (Phila.), issue of December 1, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> One finds both pleasure and profit in reading such honest, intelligent criticism as that of Father Barberis in his paper on *L'Esthémétrie et la Psychologie de St. Thomas*, read at the Catholic Congress (Paris, 1888). *Compte Rendu*, tome ii., p. 563.

of science. Volumes, in fact, are written to show that she favors the advance of knowledge. But the best argument for this thesis is the long list of names that are equally illustrious for scientific attainment and for devotion to Catholic belief. Why should not such examples be imitated and multiplied until Catholics take the lead in all departments of knowledge? It may be that in experimental psychology, as in many other lines, results come slowly. But no truth is trivial. It is better to have bits of truth than large blocks of something else, and there is no reason why Catholics should not have the honor of bringing even these fragments to light. There is no reason why we should not do in psychology what the Secchis, the Janssens, the Duchesnes, the Mivarts, and the De Rossis have done in other branches.

There are, moreover, special reasons for adopting the experimental method in the study of mind. In the first place, it is the best way to make criticism intelligent and thorough. One hour's work in the laboratory will give a clearer insight into the nature of method and experiment than a week of theoretical study. Personal research teaches the importance of details and their bearing upon large problems. And it is the only means of testing those subjective experiences upon which the conclusions of individual workers principally depend. Knowledge gained in this practical fashion secures the critic a proper hearing; he cannot be set aside on the plea that he is unacquainted with the subject.

Again, while we contend that the experimental method is not of itself bound down to any system of philosophy, we also insist that the results of experiment are susceptible of, and must finally receive, a philosophic interpretation. As Prof. Ladd, in accord with Herbart, Volkman, and Wundt, very properly says, "the relation of psychology, as a science, to the philosophy of mind, and through it to all philosophy, is so intimate and binding that not one of the larger psychological problems can be thoroughly discussed without leading up to some great debate in the field of philosophy."<sup>1</sup> One of these "larger problems," if not the largest of all, is that concerning the union between organism and mind. Scholastic philosophy explains this by saying that the soul is the substantial form of the body. But if this metaphysical teaching be true, there must be correlative truths in the empirical order by which it is elucidated and confirmed. St. Thomas implies as much when he shows why the human brain should be relatively larger in man than in other animals,<sup>2</sup> and when, to prove the dependence

<sup>1</sup> "President's Address before the New York Meeting of the American Psychological Association" (Dec., 1893), in the *Psychological Review*, vol. i., No. 1 (Jan., 1894).

<sup>2</sup> *Summ. Theol.*, p. i., q. 91, a. 3, ad 1<sup>m</sup>.

of intellection upon sensory processes, he adduces the abnormal conditions of the *phrenetici* and *lethargici*."<sup>1</sup>

That physiology and pathology have made enormous advances since the thirteenth century, no one can deny. Psychology, by taking their results into account, only follows more minutely and more accurately the example of St. Thomas. On the same ground, the results of psycho-physical experiment must directly or indirectly throw light on the connection between bodily function and mental activity, and, more remotely, upon the union of soul and body. If the spiritualist and the scholastic desire to maintain their position on this point and render it more intelligible to the scientific world, they cannot afford to hold aloof from experimental psychology.

But will they not, on entering this field, be elbowed by monists, idealists, and materialists? Granting that such will be the case, we answer that this is the strongest motive they could have for going at the work without delay. The experimental method is an effectual means of research. In itself it implies no philosophical error, but its data may be erroneously interpreted. See, now, the alternatives which confront the spiritualist. Either get hold of this instrument and use it for proper purposes, or leave it to materialists, and after they have heaped up facts, established laws, and forced their conclusions upon psychology, go about tardily to unravel, with clumsy fingers, this tangle of error. Either share in the development of the science, or prepare to wrestle with it when it has grown strong in hostile service. But do not imagine that at some future day, when the weight of scientific acquisition is all on one side, the scales can be tipped down in the opposite direction with a few general propositions and vehement assertions about philosophical "birthrights."

While some spiritualists hesitate between these two courses of action, we may remind them that Leo XIII., besides laboring in many ways by word and deed to quicken the spirit of research among Catholics, says that they should take up the study of science, "*per non lasciare quel campo aperto solo ai nemici, che da esso traggono copiose armi ad oppugnare molti veri sia rivelati, sia naturali.*"<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting, also, to see which of the above alternatives has been chosen by the chief Catholic university of the world. In opening the courses of the "*École Supérieure de Philosophie*" at Louvain, Mgr. Mercier announced that, along with biology and physiology, experimental psychology would have a place on the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, q. 84, a. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the Abp. of Catania, *Abbiamo appreso*, Jan 4, 1887.

programme.<sup>1</sup> Among the most earnest workers in Prof. Wundt's laboratory last summer, was a gentleman who is to take charge of a similar institute at Louvain. And as the school to which this institute belongs was founded by the Sovereign Pontiff, we do not doubt of its success. We are confident that the researches made there will place its director high on the roll of honor.

Another illustrious member of the Louvain teaching corps, Mgr. De Harlez, has lately described the variations of opinion regarding the modern Science of Religions. At first "a goodly number of believers, and among them some eminent minds, seeing only evil and danger in the new science, wished to proscribe it for their co-religionists and to prevent them from establishing chairs from which it might be taught. Others, clearer of sight, better informed on prevailing ideas, on the needs of the situation, convinced, besides, that a divine work cannot perish, and that Providence disposes all things for the greater good of humanity, welcomed without reserve this new child of science, and, by their example as by their words, drew with them into this new field of research even the hesitating and trembling. They thought, moreover, that no field of science should or could be interdicted to men of faith without placing them and their belief in a state of inferiority the most fatal, and that to abandon any field whatever would be to hand it over to all sorts of error, intentional and otherwise." As a consequence, "to-day the most timid believer, who is at all acquainted with scientific data, no longer dreads in the least the chimerical monsters pictured to him at the dawn of these new studies, but follows with an interest as strong as his former fear, the researches, the discoveries which savants lay before him."<sup>2</sup>

The learned writer might have added that such a revolution of opinion is not without precedent. Passing over other instances, he might have recalled the appreciation which in Paris and Oxford, at the close of the thirteenth century, condemned St. Thomas as a dangerous innovator—a judgment that was completely reversed in less than fifty years.<sup>3</sup> It is hard to say whether surprise or amusement is our dominant feeling when we read over the long list of "errors" imputed to the Angelic Doctor, and the pompous, ponderous periods in which he is denounced. And though their folly was so quickly shown, it is well for us that these documents

<sup>1</sup> *La Science Catholique*, Fév., 1891, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *The World's Parliament of Religions*, Chicago, 1893, pp. 605-7; cf. for the French text *Revue des Religions*, Sept.-Oct., 1894, p. 416.

<sup>3</sup> See the *Dissertations* of De Rubeis on the works of St. Thomas, Diss. 25, 26; cf. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Ed. Denifle, Paris, 1889), tom. i., pp. 624, 626, 634.



have been preserved. They teach us the value of others which reverberate against "modern science" in general and against the new psychology in particular. Some psychologist of the twentieth century will produce an interesting monograph on the "chimerical monsters" which were evoked to frighten people away from the Science of Religion and from other new branches of knowledge. In spite of such "monsters" the teachings of Aristotle became the rational basis of scholastic theology. Nor will similar chimeras prevent experimental psychology from serving that scientific truth in which all lines of research attain their equilibrium and live.

E. A. PACF.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

## A NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE ENCYCLICAL "PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS."

PHILOSOPHERS call negatives ill-natured (*malignantis naturæ*), theologians dread them as minimizing, poets add that "one single positive weighs more, you know, than negatives a score"; but when there is question of scavenger work, the prim, sleek positive refuses service, leaving the "dirty job" to its less respectable brother. The disproportion between respectability and usefulness is not confined to yes and no, or to the pigeon and the buzzard; it has found its way from the world of words and of nature into human society, and even into the circles of literary and scientific writers. To illustrate our statement by a concrete case, when our sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII, issued on November 18th of last year his encyclical "Providentissimus Deus," there was hardly a review or a periodical of Catholic tendency that did not reprint the same, whole or in part, with a more or less complete commentary on its meaning.<sup>1</sup> Not as if all these comments had

<sup>1</sup> Among the countless number of these publications, the following deserve attention: Father Brandi in *Civiltà Cattolica*, nn. 1048-1065; Knabenbauer in *Laacher Stimmen*, 1894, ii; Dr. Selbest in *Katholik*, Feb., March, April, 1894; Dr. Hoberg in *Kathol. Seelsorger*, Feb., 1894; Nisius in *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv.; Very Rev. Canon Howlett in *Dublin Review*, July, 1894; see also *Dubl. Rev.* for Oct., 1894; Conway in *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, April, 1894; Clark in *Contemporary Review*, July, 1894; Lucas in *The Month*, June, July, 1894; Maguire in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Jan., 1894; the Editor in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Feb., 1894.

been purely exegetic or laudatory; but even the most adverse criticisms were couched in positive statements—a negative commentary would have destroyed the man of straw they attacked!—so that the following exegetical notes have not been wholly forestalled. Had they appeared before this, they would have been liable to misinterpretation, or at least, to an extension of meaning beyond their rightful limits.

# I.—THE ENCYCLICAL IS NOT DIRECTLY DOGMATIC.

That the Encyclical documents of the Sovereign Pontiffs vary in their character between dogmatic, disciplinary and parenetic addresses, is plain from their difference in scope and contents. To exemplify this statement, we draw the reader's attention to a few of the Encyclicals of our present Pope, Leo XIII. They treat of the evils of Human society,<sup>1</sup> of socialistic errors,<sup>2</sup> of the study of St. Thomas Aquinas,<sup>3</sup> of the sanctity of Christian marriage,<sup>4</sup> of the propagation of the faith,<sup>5</sup> of political authority,<sup>6</sup> of freemasonry,<sup>7</sup> of the Christian constitution of civil society,<sup>8</sup> of evangelical liberty,<sup>9</sup> of the duties of Christian citizens,<sup>10</sup> of the abolition of slavery,<sup>11</sup> of the condition of the working classes,<sup>12</sup> of the return of princes and nations to religious unity.<sup>13</sup> Such a variety in scope and subject of Encyclical letters justifies in each given case an inquiry into the precise drift of the document, in order to ascertain whether it be chiefly dogmatic, disciplinary or parenetic.

Our Holy Father has deemed it right to entitle the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" "De Studiis Scripturæ Sacræ," not "De Scriptura Sacra," i.e., on certain courses of lectures on Holy Scripture (which the bishops are advised to establish in their seminaries, if they have not already done so), not "on Holy Scripture."<sup>14</sup> This points rather to a disciplinary measure than a dogmatic pronouncement. Not satisfied with this significant title, the august author in the exordium states expressly his purpose "to

<sup>1</sup> Among the adverse critics may be named the anonymous writer in the *Contemporary*, April, August, 1894; a pseudonymous writer in the *Rassegna Nazionale*; among Protestant publications which are not however, always written in an adverse spirit, we may name the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1894; the Ritualist Ignatius as quoted in the *Catholic Times*, Liverpool; Mr. Gore, in the *Guardian*, April 11, 1894; the writer in the *Spectator*, April 28, 1894, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Inscrutabili*, April 21, 1878.

<sup>3</sup> *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, Dec. 28, 1878.

<sup>4</sup> *Æterni Patris*, Aug. 4, 1879.

<sup>5</sup> *Sancta Dei Civitas*, Dec. 3, 1880.

<sup>6</sup> *Humanum Genus*, April 20, 1884.

<sup>7</sup> *Libertas*, June 20, 1888.

<sup>8</sup> *Catholicæ Ecclesiæ*, Nov. 20, 1890.

<sup>9</sup> *Praclara Gratulationis*, June 20, 1894.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Contemporary Review*, July, p. 42, note.

<sup>11</sup> *Arcanum*, Feb. 10, 1880.

<sup>12</sup> *Diuturnum*, June 29, 1881.

<sup>13</sup> *Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885.

<sup>14</sup> *Sapientiæ Christianæ*, Jan. 10, 1890.

<sup>15</sup> *Rerum Novarum*, May 15, 1891.

give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture, and to impart to Scripture study a direction suitable to the needs of the present day.<sup>1</sup>

To render the foregoing statement plainer still our Holy Father explains both the impulse and the direction he intends to give to the study of Sacred Scripture. The impulse springs from his "desire that this grand source of Catholic revelation should be made safely and abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ," while the direction suggests measures "not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt it (the source of Catholic revelation), either on the part of those who impiously and openly assail the Scriptures or of those who are led astray into fallacious and imprudent novelties." Thus far everything points to forthcoming disciplinary measures rather than dogmatic canons, though a certain amount of doctrine may be the necessary basis of the rules of action about to be issued.

This conclusion is not altered by a perusal of the document itself; the division indicated in the exordium<sup>2</sup> has been strictly adhered to throughout: A. The Holy Father incites to the study of the Bible for two reasons: *a.* Its utility; *b.* Its relation to the Church. *a* is both,  $\alpha$ , doctrinal and,  $\beta$ , oratorical;  $\alpha$  is proved by the words and practice of Jesus Christ, of the Apostles and of the Fathers of the Church;  $\beta$  is based on the authority of Holy Writ and of the Fathers. *b.* The Bible's relation to the Church is manifested,  $\alpha$ , by express legislation (Divine office, school of Sacred Scripture in cathedrals and monasteries, dominical gospels) and,  $\beta$ , by the constant use the Church has made of the Bible (in the times of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, of the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools down to the period of the Scholastics to the Council of Trent and our own times). B. The Sovereign Pontiff directs the Bible study: *a.* Its exegesis, determining after a review of our present-day opponents, the training which professors should receive and the manner in which they should teach (introduction and laws of hermeneutics); *b.* The defense of the Bible against recent attacks:  $\alpha$ . Its authenticity and credibility are to be established;  $\beta$ . The objections of orientalists and critics must be met;  $\gamma$ . The difficulties of the scientists are to be answered;  $\delta$ . The exceptions of the historians and antiquarians must be satisfied;  $\epsilon$ . Catholics ought to assist these studies by material aid. The Encyclical ends with an appeal to the bishops

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Authorized version, which will be commonly quoted throughout, though we shall have to take exception to a few renderings in the otherwise creditable work.

<sup>2</sup> We are sorry to see this division abandoned in the paragraph headings of the authorized version; unless the reader is very attentive he will be led to miss the logical structure of the Encyclical.

and priests to act according to the wise counsel of the Vicar of Christ upon earth. Notice once more that in all this there is nothing directly dogmatic, though the advice of the Pontiff supposes and implies certain dogmatic truths and even asserts them plainly (the inerrancy of the Bible, *e.g.*). It always does so with a view of establishing the correctness of the method of Scripture study inculcated in the Encyclical.

## II.—THE ENCYCLICAL IS NOT INTENDED TO BE AN EX CATHEDRA UTTERANCE.

This point has already been emphasized in the "Dublin Review"<sup>1</sup> and in the "Contemporary Review."<sup>2</sup> The latter writer defends the moderation of Leo XIII. against the impatient expectations of the anonymous writer,<sup>3</sup> and the former maintains his position against Mr. Gore's contention<sup>4</sup> that the document "is meant to be an ex cathedra pronouncement," but that, "no doubt, some reason may be found to declare the Encyclical not infallible."

No Catholic disputes the Holy Father's right and power to issue an ex cathedra decree either in the form of an Encyclical or about some of the questions treated in "*Providentissimus Deus*;" but the venerable author himself has declared equivalently that he did not intend doing so in the document now under discussion. Had he intended his Encyclical to be regarded as an infallible utterance he would have in some way manifested his intention. Circular letters of the Apostolic See, as such, are not considered as ex cathedra pronouncements, unless they acquire this character through additional circumstances or expressed declarations. These failing, they do not claim to have been issued with the aid of the charisma of infallibility. Moreover, the rhetorical style and the oratorical language of the document, together with the manner of its publication, preclude the idea that it should be an ex cathedra utterance. Finally, if the document were an ex cathedra utterance, or had been intended as such, why should not the competent ecclesiastical authorities, who know and understand that theologians place the Encyclical on the level of the other circular letters, protest against this mode of interpretation and establish the document on its intended footing? This silence is as eloquent as the most sublime passages on the nature of inspiration and the divine authorship of our sacred books. It must, however, be kept in mind that the want of an ex cathedra utterance on a given point of doctrine or morals does not render that point doubtful, nor does it destroy the scientific value of the testimony solemnly uttered by the

<sup>1</sup> July, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Cf. Contemporary Review*, April.

<sup>3</sup> July, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Guardian*, April 11th.

witness, supreme in all matters theological, in favor of the Catholic character of certain tenets in dogma or morals.

### III.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT TEACH VERBAL INSPIRATION.

Here we must first acquaint ourselves with the meaning of verbal inspiration. In Holy Scripture, as in every other book, we may distinguish between the contents and the form of the writing. When our papers and periodicals announced the death of the Czar of Russia nearly all gave the same facts and moral reflections, but their manner of expression varied. Applying this to our Sacred Books the question arises whether God inspired the very words of Scripture or only the truths and facts contained therein. But the concept of verbal inspiration must be limited still more before a definite answer can be given. There are in Sacred Scripture mysteries that could not have been clad in proper language by man left to his own resources, *e.g.*, of the persons of the Holy Trinity and the proper expression for the Word of God; again, there are passages in Holy Writ that claim almost expressly to be the literal reproductions of God's verbal revelation, such as the precepts of the decalogue and the forms of the sacraments; thirdly, the literary form of the inspired writings, whether historical or epistolary, their manner of expression, whether poetry or prose, their general arrangement and order of material, whether chronological or topological, appear to be the result of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But the question we ask here is, whether, beside the general arrangement of the subject, the general manner of expression, the literary form of the writing, besides the sacramental and uncommonly privileged words, the Holy Ghost directly dictated all words and sentences, arranged all parts according to their division and subdivision, and colored all expressions with their peculiar hue of beauty and feeling.

It is true that to an uninitiated reader the words of the Sovereign Pontiff may appear to suppose such an inspiration as we have described. "Dictated by the Holy Ghost, it (the Sacred Scripture) contains things of the deepest importance . . ." Again, "for all the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost." Besides, the Holy Father uses the words of St. Gregory the Great:<sup>1</sup> "He wrote it, who dictated it for writing; He wrote it, who inspired its execution." Finally, a similar saying is quoted from St. Augustine:<sup>2</sup> "Since they (the inspired writers) wrote the things which he showed and uttered to them, it cannot be pretended that he is not the writer"; for

<sup>1</sup> Praef. in Job, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Decons, Evgg. I, I, c. 35.

"his members executed what their Head had dictated." From these passages one might argue thus: According to the words of the Sovereign Pontiff, the inspired writers wrote wholly and entirely under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, as the hand (member) writes under the direction of the head. But to write wholly and entirely under dictation, as the hand writes under the direction of the head, implies verbal inspiration. Therefore, according to the doctrine of the Sovereign Pontiff, the sacred writers wrote under verbal inspiration.

A remark concerning the major premise of this argument before considering the double meaning of its middle term. The passage rendered "for all the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost," differs somewhat from the Latin original. The latter reads: "Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt," *i.e.*, "for the books, all and entire, which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, with all their parts, are written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost." The phrase "all and entire, with all their parts," does not qualify the phrase "under the dictation of the Holy Ghost" but the subject of the sentence. Such a transposition of the qualifying phrase may be of no importance where the *qualified* phrase is not susceptible of degrees; a dead man, *e.g.*, is as badly off as a man wholly dead. But in the passage now under consideration this is not the case; every one knows the difference between books all written under my direction and books written wholly under my direction, between men all black and men wholly black. The writer in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY*<sup>1</sup> is, therefore, right in rendering the above passage: "For all those books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, in their entirety and in their parts, have been written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost."

This observation modifies the middle term of the foregoing argument considerably; instead of having to deal with men who wrote "wholly and entirely under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, as the hand writes under the direction of the head" we have only "men writing under the dictation of the Holy Ghost as the hand writes under the direction of the head." The reader has no doubt, recognized that this expression is taken from the writings of St. Augustine and St. Gregory; we cannot, therefore, be wrong in attributing to it the meaning it has in those venerable authors

---

<sup>1</sup> April, p. 426, at top of page.

St. Augustine<sup>1</sup> states expressly: "To know this is of use both for our morals, in order to avoid and discriminate falsehood, and for our faith, lest we consider truth as so wrapped up in consecrated sounds, as if God commended to us the words spoken to manifest the truth, as well as the truth itself." The same holy doctor says of St. Jerome that he writes not only under the influence, but under the dictation of the Holy Ghost (*non tantum donante, verum etiam dictante Spiritu*). No one would on this account place St. Jerome, in the esteem of St. Augustine, on a level with the inspired authors of Sacred Scripture. St. Gregory the Great in his homilies, fully agrees with the doctrine of St. Augustine, while in another passage he receives Canon 41, certainly not written under verbal inspiration, as he receives the gospels.<sup>2</sup> The words of St. Jerome<sup>3</sup> are more explicit still: "Let others seek after syllables and letters, but seek you for sentences. . . . Let my maligners seek and understand that in Sacred Scriptures not the words but the meaning has to be considered." Though Hass<sup>4</sup> contends that the theory of verbal inspiration was received into the early Church with the dogmatico-Platonic doctrine, and though the Augustinian Father Fernandez<sup>5</sup> endeavors to show that the theory of verbal inspiration agrees with the tradition of the Fathers generally, with the teaching of theologians and with the common principles of faith, these are only weak and stray voices, drowned in the general chorus of the present day theological writers who attest the contrary.<sup>6</sup>

When the Fathers speak as if every letter and title of Holy Scriptures were sacred, they merely emphasize the infallibility of the writing resulting from the divine assistance granted to the inspired authors; when they speak of the sacred writers as instruments of the Holy Ghost, they lay stress on the infallible impulse God exerted on the writers' will and God's consequent principal authorship of the Scriptures, without denying to the inspired writers the privilege of co-operating with God's work after the manner of intelligent and free agents; when they represent the inspired authors as composing under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, they express forcibly the fact that every truth contained in Holy Writ was, either mediately or immediately, either by revelation in its strictest sense or by a supernatural comprehensive judg-

<sup>1</sup> *Dc cons. Evgg.* i, 2., c. 65; *cf.* ii. 28, c. 12, n. 27-29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* 120; *Leo*, *ep.* 115, al. 73; *August.* *ep.* 82, i, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 57, ad *Pammach.* n. 6, 10

<sup>4</sup> *P.* 379.

<sup>5</sup> *Revista Augustiniana*, Valladolid, 1884, vols. vii., viii.

<sup>6</sup> *Cf.* *Innsbrücker, Zeitschrift*, 8385, pp. 670 ff.; *Schmids De Inspirationis Bibliorum Vi et Ratione*, pp. 280, 259; *Denzinger, Religiöse Erkenntnisse*, ii., pp. 238 ff.; *Sahanz, Christian Apology*, ii., pp. 418 ff.

ment concerning the truthfulness of facts and principles known by natural means, divinely proposed to the intellect of the same authors, without implying the necessity that the outward force should be divinely infused. Not to urge the wide meaning of the Latin word "dictare" (to say often, to dictate, to suggest, to counsel, to order, etc.), even its strictest meaning satisfies the foregoing patristic texts without resorting to verbal inspiration. Did not God dictate, at times, His truth in purely intellectual visions unmixed with the sensible apparatus of words? Did He not also make use of sensible visions, either of the imagination or of the external sense, without supplying the words needed to express the vision in language? Again, did He not dictate His truth in one language<sup>1</sup> where the inspired writer had to express the same in another language?<sup>2</sup> It is, therefore, not without reason that we distinguish the meaning of the middle term employed in the above argument; the inspired authors wrote under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, because they received from Him, mediately or immediately, all the truths they recorded, but not because the Holy Ghost supplied the outward expression of those truths. Again, the inspired authors wrote as free and intelligent agents and instruments of the Holy Ghost, and not as His dead and material tools.

In the light of this explanation we are enabled to understand the words in which the Sovereign Pontiff explains the nature of inspiration: "By supernatural power He so moved and impelled them to write—He was so present to them—that the things which He ordered, and those only, they first, rightly understood" (illumination of the intellect), then willed faithfully to write down (impulse of the will, rendering the writers instruments of God) and finally expressed in apt words and with infallible truth" (assistance during the writing). If we prescind from the diversity of opinion with regard to the nature of the supernatural light imparted to the writers' intellect concerning the truths they knew naturally, and with regard to the actuality of the divine assistance—whether it was "in actu primo" or always "in actu secundo"—these two questions excepted, on which the Encyclical is silent, it expresses the common opinion of Catholic theologians on the nature of inspiration.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew, *e.g.*

<sup>2</sup> St. John, *e.g.*

<sup>3</sup> We do not like this rendering of "recte mente conciperent"; it appears to say that the inspired writers *always* understood the truth they were writing, an assumption that is denied by grave authors; Cf. Franzelin, *De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, ed. 3, p. 358, coroll. 3, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Franzelin, *l.c.* Thes. iii., iv.; Schmid, *De Inspir. Biblior.*, pp. 1-114; Trochon, *Introd. Generale*, pp. 52 ff.; Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique*, pp. 14 ff.; Ubaldi, *Introd.*, ii., pp. 52 ff.; Densinger, *Religiöse Erkenntniss*, ii., pp. 223 ff.; Dixon, *On*



IV.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT ADD TO THE TRIDENTINE AND THE VATICAN DECREES.

We have already noted that the document is not directly dogmatic, but proposes doctrine only in so far as is required by the practical rules of interpretation inculcated. The dogmatic pronouncement of this kind most prominent in the Encyclical regards the inerrancy of Scripture. It is true that the Pontiff touches also upon the nature of inspiration, as has just been seen, but only by way of proving the inerrancy, inferring from the nature of inspiration that God is the principal author of Holy Writ, and that the sacred writers are only his instruments, so that any error in the text would have to be imputed to God himself.

But is not the doctrine of the inerrancy itself something beyond the conciliar decrees on Bible subjects? At least, is it not proved in a manner that necessarily extends the meaning of the Council's decrees? We grant that the Vatican Council did not intend to add anything to the Tridentine decrees concerning the *extent* of inspiration.<sup>1</sup> This was expressly and repeatedly stated in the Council itself by J. Simor, the Primate of Hungary, Cardinal Franzelin, the speaker on the order, end and style of the dogmatic "schema," V. Gasser and the reporter on the congregational sessions,<sup>2</sup> and is repeated in the classical commentary on the Vatican Council by Father Granderath.<sup>3</sup> We also grant that the Council of Trent declared the Holy Scriptures as sacred and canonical not in general but in concrete form, "as they are had in the ancient Latin Vulgate," in which there are several contradictions,<sup>4</sup> and, therefore, errors. Must we, then, grant that the Council did not establish the inerrancy of Sacred Scriptures since we grant the existence of errors in the concrete form of the books declared sacred and canonical by the Council? What has been said shows the fallacy of the argument for the inerrancy, as it is proposed by some writers. They enunciate their major, "si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus . . . pro sacris et ca-

*Sacred Scripture*, i., pp 9 ff.; Mellini, *Instit. Biblic.*, pp. 14 ff.; Cano, de 11. theol., ii.; Suarez, *de fide*, disp. 8; Cherub, a Sancto Josepho, *Summ. criticae sacrae* iv.; Scheeben, *Kathol. Dogmat.*, i., pp. 100 ff., Marchini, *De Divinit. et Canonicit. Biblior.*; Kleutgen, *de sententia Lessii*, appendix to Schneemunn's *de div. grat.*, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp 653 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Coll. Lac.*, vii., col. 80, 86, 141, 522, 1621.

<sup>3</sup> *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vat.*, Frib., 1892, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Compare II. Kings, xxi., 8, with II. Kings, vii., 23, I. Kings, xxv., 44, and I. Kings, xviii., 19; also IV Kings, viii., 23, with II. Par., xxvi., 9, etc. Cf. Mariana, *pro Vulgata*, c. 22. For our purposes it suffices to notice the errors of this kind in the Vulgate. We need not, therefore, here enter upon the question of the Vulgate's inspiration or its immunity from all errors, even in matters not relating to faith and morals, or its immunity from all errors except in minor details referring to Bible animals and plants. Cf. Cornely, *Introd.*, i., pp. 442 ff.

nonicis non suscepit; Anathema sit." By thus mutilating the decree they make it treat of the Sacred Books 'in general, instead of their concrete form in the ancient Latin Vulgate, which cannot bear the extension these writers give to the clause, "intergros cum omnibus suis partibus."<sup>1</sup>

Denying the inference, we may render its premises harmless in two ways: First. The Council determines the concrete form of the books which it considers as sacred and canonical by two qualifying clauses; they must be contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate, and they must be the traditional reading in the Church, Catholic not only in place but also in time.<sup>2</sup> If the Vulgate be taken in the light of this textual material, its present inaccuracies will no longer serve as an obstacle to the Church's declaration of the Bible's inerrancy. Second. Though the Council of Trent does not expressly insist on the dogma of Biblical inerrancy, it enunciates expressly the dogma on which Biblical inerrancy rests and from which it flows, by proclaiming in distinct terms that God is the author of both the Old and the New Testament.<sup>3</sup> It is precisely from this dogma that our Sovereign Pontiff most emphatically infers: "It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the sacred writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration (which is convertible with principal authorship), or make God the author of such an error." That this inference has not been clearly formulated by the Council proves nothing against our position, because, at the time of the Council, Biblical inerrancy was considered as a matter of course.<sup>4</sup> If we may refer to Franzelin's view on the different stadia of a dogma,<sup>5</sup> we can say that the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy has passed from the first period, in which it held undisputed sway in the theological world, to the second, where it is called in question; whether and when it will reach the third stage of a defined dogma, we must leave to history to decide.

But if Biblical inerrancy is really contained in the decrees of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, n. 1048, p. 414, *et passim*; *Controverse*, 1884, ii., p. 545; *les Études*, 1892, i., p. 663; *Science Catholique*, 1893, pp. 239. f.; against these, *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., p. 664 note.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cornely, *Introd.*, i., p. 452.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Denzinger, *Enchir.*, n. 666.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Canus, *De Locc. Theol.*, ii., 17; Bellarm., *De Verb. Dei*, i., 6; Corluy in *Science Catholique*, 1893, pp. 481 ff.; Franzelin, *l. c.*, Thes. iii., part i., n. 1, note; Dausch, *die Schriftinspiration*, Freiburg, 1891, pp. 45-86; Crets, *Dissert. Dogmat. de Biblior. Inspirat.*, Lov., 1886, pp. 257 ff.; *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp. 670 ff.; Schmid, *De Inspirat. Biblior.*, p. 3, n. 4; p. 12, nn. 16, 17. Even Protestant authorities grant us this, as may be seen in Sanday's "Inspiration," *Bampton Lectures* for 1893, pp. 392 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *De Divina Tradit.*, Thes. xxiii., p. iv.

the Tridentine and the Vatican Councils, can it be maintained that the clause "entire, with all their parts,"<sup>1</sup> has not been interpreted in the Encyclical as having a special bearing on this point?

Catholic theologians had given various interpretations of the word "parts:" *a.* Vercellone limits the extent of the "parts" to the deuterocanonical portions of Sacred Scripture that were rejected by Protestants at the time of the Tridentine Council.<sup>2</sup> This interpretation extols the historical occasion of the insertion of the clause "entire, with all their parts," at the expense of its obvious meaning in the decree, and of its intended object to prevent future errors similar to those of the early Protestants. *b.* Bukentop<sup>3</sup> extends the meaning of "parts" so as to embrace every single sentence in the Sacred Books; we have already seen that the concrete form under which the inspired writings were proposed by the Councils does not admit such an extensive meaning. *c.* Franzelin<sup>4</sup> limits the meaning of "parts" to the substantial entirety of Sacred Scripture, but in dogmatic and moral passages he too extends the meaning so as to embrace all utterances. The Cardinal grants that his position cannot be established from the words of the decrees, but he appeals in his proof to the scope and object of the Council of Trent. It is true that the Council announces its purpose of arguing from the alleged sources as from divine authority; but to have divine authority an argument need not rest on an *inspired* truth; it may be based on simply *revealed* truth, come down to us through tradition. The conciliar arguments do not therefore lose their force, even if they are based on a revealed truth that has somehow found its way into our copies of Holy Scripture. *d.* Cardinal Wiseman<sup>5</sup> is of opinion that "parts" in the Tridentine decree means those portions of Holy Writ that are required to constitute the sacred books, morally speaking, entire. Portions of this kind would be, *e.g.*, the history of the resuscitation of Lazarus or the story of the adulterous woman. The common meaning of "parts of a book"; the occasion of the insertion of the clause "with all their parts"; the context "entire,

<sup>1</sup> The Authorized version reads: "The Books of the Old and New Testament, whole and entire, with all their parts, as enumerated in the decree of the same Council (Trent) and in the ancient Latin Vulgate . . . ." This rendering appears to reduce the ancient Latin Vulgate to a mere catalogue, which, like the Tridentine catalogue, merely *enumerates* the sacred books. We have seen that the inspired books have been canonized by the Council not merely as they are enumerated in the Vulgate, but as they exist in it: "prout . . . in veteri Vulgata Latina editione habentur."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Revue Catholique*, Nov., Dec., Jan., 1866-67; Azevedo, *pro Vulg.*; Lamy, *Introd.*, i., p. 172.

<sup>3</sup> *Paedag.*, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> *De Script.*, Thes. xix.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Migne, *Demonstrat.*, t. 16, pp. 304 f.

with all their parts"; the absence of another satisfactory interpretation of the phrase, all these are as many arguments in favor of this last opinion.<sup>1</sup> The Encyclical, so far from giving the clause any new meaning in the argument, rather accepts it in the meaning last explained. The Holy Father repudiates "the system of those who, in order to rid themselves of these (historical and antiquarian) difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond . . . ." Among these authors may be classed, with certain qualifications, Newman, Mivart, Lenormant, Loisy, di Bartolo, Semeria, Savi, Rohling, Drey, Kuhn, Aberle, Schanz.<sup>2</sup> To exclude this error, the words of the Vatican Council are cited according to which inspiration regards "all the books of the Old and New Testament, in their entirety and their parts," historical as well as moral and dogmatic.

That the Holy Father wishes his argument to be understood in this restricted meaning is confirmed by his express words in which he appeals to what is "solemnly defined in the Councils of Florence and Trent, and finally confirmed and more expressly formulated by the Council of the Vatican." We have seen that the Vatican Council adds nothing concerning the extent of inspiration to the decrees of Trent; we have also seen the limits required by the concrete form in which the Council of Trent canonizes the sacred books; the Council of Florence merely inculcates the divine authorship of both the Old and New Testament.<sup>3</sup> The Sovereign Pontiff, therefore, argues *immediately* indeed from the obvious meaning of the clause "entire, with all their parts," but *inferentially* from the fact that God is the author of Holy Writ; but neither argument adds anything to the conciliar decrees. This does not destroy the overwhelming value of the argument from Catholic tradition to which we have already referred.

#### V.—THE ENCYCLICAL DOES NOT ASCRIBE ABSOLUTE TRUTH TO THE WHOLE BIBLE.

This statement is almost literally expressed in the circular letter itself. "They (the sacred writers) did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were com-

---

<sup>1</sup> It is quite another question how far the Church *can* declare the *entire* uniformity of our present Bible text with its original form: Cf. *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, 1894, iv., pp. 760 f.; *Nouvelle Rev. Theologique de Tournay*, 1893, pp. 428 ff.; Loisy, *Histoire du Canon du Nouveau Test.*, pp. 236 ff.; *Revue des Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, 1887, ii., pp. 103, 489; 1889, i., pp. 235, 390 ff., 481 ff.; Franzelin, *l. c.*, ed. 3, pp. 517 549, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Innsbrücker Zeitschrift*, *l. c.* pp. 632 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Denz. Echir.*, n. 600.

monly used at the time, and which, in many instances, are in daily use at present, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses, and somewhat in the same way the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor also reminds us—“went by what sensibly appeared,” or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in the way men could understand and were accustomed to.” This accommodation on the part of God to man’s ways of thinking and expressing thought may be extended without scruple or difficulty so far as men are accustomed to regard such relative expressions as contained within the limits of truthfulness. No man is regarded as violating the laws of veracity because he speaks of the rising and the setting of the sun, though the world is loud in its denouncement of a college of Roman theologians who censured Galileo for not adhering to the absolute truth of this Biblical expression. Our painters and poets are not considered as untruthful, though they represent their theme strikingly by expressing the surrounding thoughts and objects in a general and less emphatic manner; and shall we consider a Hebrew historian or moralist guilty of falsehood because he tells his facts in a manner customary among his contemporaries, because he states his measures and times in round numbers instead of decimals, because he writes under a name that had become almost necessarily connected with all similar literature, because he conveys under the form of parables and seeming histories important moral truths? If the Book of Job, excepting the historic facts concerning the sufferer, is a didactic poem on the philosophy of evil,<sup>1</sup> if Our Lord Jesus Christ himself narrates the story of Dives and Lazarus, are we, therefore, to call in question the relative veracity of either? We know that this relative truth has been urged to an excess; Jahn, Movers, and Scholz, though they be faithful Catholics, have denied the strictly historical character of the Book of Judith, Dereser and Scholz of the Book of Esther, others of the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis.<sup>2</sup> But abuse never shows the illicitness of proper use, excess never condemns moderation. The limits of relative truth in inspired writings are identical with its limits in profane authors; analogies, metaphors, figures of speech, national mannerisms of expression and style, poetic licenses and lyric flights, these are only a few of the instances in which we look for relative truthfulness. When doubt arises, when it is asked in Gen. 1:2, *e.g.*, whether the inspired writer has literally forestalled

<sup>1</sup> *Summ. Theol.*, i, p. q. 80, a. 1, ad. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Cf. Cornely, Introd. II.*, ii, n. 177, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup> *Cf. Dublin Review*, July, 1894, p. 77; *The Month*, June, p. 154

the modern cosmogonic theories, we must ultimately refer to the tribunal that is supreme in all that refers to the authentic interpretation of the inspired writings, to the voice of the Church, the agreement, moral or absolute, of the fathers, the teachings of the theologians, and the analogy of faith.

VI. By way of conclusion we may draw attention to a number of other negatives in the Encyclical which are less important in themselves but show the admirable prudence and caution of the Holy Father none the less. Relating what Catholics have done for Holy Scripture, Leo XIII. does not mention the Polyglott of Cardinal Ximenez; though condemning the opinion that the "Apostolic Gospels and writings are not the work of the Apostles at all," the Pontiff is silent about the authors of the Old Testament writings, only warning us against considering them as falsehoods and forgeries of men, as stupid fables and lying stories, as predictions made after the event or forecasts formed by the light of nature, as containing only startling effects of natural laws or mere tricks or myths; he does not forbid the use of non-Catholic books, but warns us to be prudent in their study; he does not condemn the use of internal evidence, but shows where it can be employed with the best effect; he does not bind us to the Vulgate text alone, but enjoins the use of the versions approved by Christian antiquity, and more especially that of the ancient MSS. Why, then, all those lamentations with which the *Contemporary* flooded the world? "With desolation is all the land made desolate, because there is none that considereth in the heart." <sup>1</sup>

WOODSTOCK, MD.

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xii., ii.

## THE TREASURES OF THE CHURCH.

MORE than once have American friends put the question to the writer why it is that all the romance, philosophy, criticism, politics and poetry—the whole existence, in short, of Europe as known to them—is so deeply tinged with sadness. What has made men on this side of the Atlantic a melancholy race, who cannot sing but they must pitch their music in the minor key, neither write a story which shall not be tragical, nor look with favor upon a system of first principles unless its last word be annihilation, Nirvana and the everlasting silence? To a buoyant young temper, such as the native American prides himself upon possessing, there is something distasteful, not to say unreasonable, in all this continual sobbing and sighing which the ocean breezes bear across the waves from London, Paris, Berlin and the air of Leipzig. He turns away when it meets the ear, not as one might who is overcome with pity on occasion of another's trouble, but in the slightly contemptuous mood of a strong man at the bedside of an hypochondriac or a valetudinarian. These revolts and regrets, these elegies which are bathed in tears have no charm for the busy, energetic, hopeful citizen of a new world which is every day growing richer and more populous, and which, in spite of crises and defalcations, blizzards and earthquake, feels supreme confidence in the present and the future. What, then, our friends ask us wonderingly, has befallen the Old World that all its literature should resemble the prophet's scroll and be written over with lamentations and mourning and woe? Have we Europeans run our course, lived the span of life allotted to us, and are we nearing the end of our tempestuous chronicle? Is it the time of sunset in these ancient kingdoms, or does the dirge-like tone which pervades our latest compositions forebode the night and the darkness wherein other worlds, as fair to look upon as our own, have been engulfed? We are neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; and who will dare to lift the veil which hides to-morrow from our eyes? But we can study the past; we may compare one period with another and note their likeness; we are bidden to watch for the signs that betoken great historic changes, lest they take us unawares. Is it possible, then, to overlook the morbid symptoms, the lack of vitality, the nervous unrest, the running to and fro and the steadily mounting agitation—the fever which has laid hold upon thousands in our most crowded cities, or the frivolity, no less feverish, that

reigns among the so-called upper classes, the wealthy, high-born, official and fashionable, who are girt round about with a ring of poverty-stricken proletarians, by no means content to abide in their forlorn condition? Our democracy, unlike the American, is a militant system; it means revolution. The old faith or loyalty or attachment to our born and predestinate rulers is passing away. Government, which was counted a mystery, has become an open secret; statecraft is now the eloquent rhetoric whereby a crowd can be persuaded to accept a fresh programme. Property must show its titles, and those not merely forensic but human, else it will go hard with it in the day of law-making, which is now, for so many interests, traditions, inheritances, monopolies and corporations, little less than the day of judgment itself. "*Quod populo placuit, id legis vim habet*"—these words may be taken as briefly summing up the new order of ideas, not yet carried into effect at Westminster (no, nor altogether at Washington), but furnishing a creed and a propaganda, over against which no other principles seem able to stand.

Now, in America, the sovereignty of the people is a commonplace, and, as all men have built on this foundation, there appears a certain unity in the design, a simplicity which is likewise strength, that does not fail to impress strangers, be their sentiments friendly or hostile, who travel in the United States. But our condition in Europe is far more complicated. We find ourselves building up new institutions on the ruins of the old; mixing in one confused, though picturesque, edifice the styles of all ages, from early Egyptian, so to speak, down to that of the Renaissance, and always driven to a compromise between the present and the past. In consequence, neither the true blue conservative nor the reformer of root and branch feels much satisfaction on contemplating a result to which both have lent a hand. Their æsthetic or logical instinct asks for a consistent scheme, which is ever denied them. Yet this, perhaps, would not signify were the outcome a practical system of life and action in which all could find a place; and, hitherto, it has been no such thing. The arch rises to a certain height and then it begins to crack and shiver; it threatens to fall this way and that way, and needs to be shored up continually with fresh enactments and contrivances, all betokening that the keystone is not yet discovered which shall bind its parts together. That keystone, as religious men believe, never will be made to crown and secure the edifice until a living and divine faith is universally recognized as the prologue, or first article, of the constitution.

But those who have governed Europe for a long generation agree with the anarchists they are vainly attempting to put down,



in their fundamental principle, viz., that religion, if not a dream, is, at any rate, merely a private sentiment, a matter of taste and liking, a humor, an idiosyncrasy, which can as little furnish the preamble of laws or the corner-stone of a polity as any other individual difference. They are defending with all the resources of the arm of flesh wherein they trust, an order of things which the wielders of dynamite aim at shattering in pieces; yet neither the civil authorities nor the disciples of Kropotkin appeal to the divine element in men, but only to his interests as a bourgeois or his despair and rage as an enslaved proletarian. The springs of action which both alike assume—what are they but appetites, and not ideals? On this view, the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong; might becomes right; Mammon reigns supreme; and the purpose of life is an epicurean sum of pleasures misnamed happiness.

It is astonishing how widespread are the ravages of a materialism that deals with both our best and noblest instincts as though they were ingrained delusions. Everywhere the passion for luxury, and the love of money as the chief means of procuring it, find open acknowledgement. All men—nay, all women—it is said, have a price; to be rich implies that you can buy not merely anything but any one, from the prince who leads society to the journalist who was yesterday a socialist orator and who to-day lives in a great house at South Kensington and calls himself a conservative. Marriage is too often a mere bargain, which holds good until one of the partners sells the other or receives compensation for disturbance in the divorce court. Business, pleasure and politics take the form of gambling, which is invariably dishonest when it can escape detection. Literature is prurient, vulgar, unclean, personal, anarchic, and yet, for the most part, dilettante, occupying itself with the sordid or the trivial, but not daring to affirm either a law of righteousness or faith in the world to come. Last of all, religion in the churches of the Reformation has been thrown into a series of dissolving views, where each presents a larger blank surface than the preceding one, and formless clouds usurp the place where figures of distinct outline and life-like features were of old time visible.

Thus every day seems to plunge Europeans deeper into chaos. Social bands are loosening with frightful rapidity; no man can tell what rights, duties or privileges permanently belong to him; and the multitude of prophets do not add to the sum of wisdom. The hurricane blows in succession from every point of the compass, and individuals, bewildered, panic-stricken, or as good as paralyzed, know not which way to turn amid so great and growing a confusion. Moral authority, claimed at once by Herbert Spencer, Car-

lyle, Tolstoi, Ibsen and Professor Huxley, is reduced to the absurd ; and private judgment, were any man robust enough to exercise it, would of necessity triumph when the wisest are springing at one another's throats. Nevertheless, we do not live in the age of robust individualism ; the crowd is more imitative than ever ; and genius, distinction, character—the godlike attributes of man—can with difficulty maintain themselves against a pressure from without which is every day multiplying its deadly force. That sacred solitude, the nurse of thoughts inspired from on high, and of resolves which have changed the face of the world no longer invites the spirit to enter in and dwell there, for children have had their fresh young lives corrupted ere they put off the golden wings of youth. Education does not suffer them to dream, to muse, to find their true selves in the presence of an enchanted nature. They must join in the rush, compete and struggle, be taught the vulgarities in which their parents believe, and never know that they are sacrificing the divinest poetry to a fierce and withering reality, until it is too late, and they have followed a multitude to do evil.

Is it wonderful, then, if the more contemplative, or such as Wordsworth praises, the men whose hearts “beat to the heroic song of ancient days,” on looking around them, are struck with sadness and refuse to take comfort in the spectacle of an ease and wealth which spell “decadence” no less than “democracy?” Their eyes have been purged as with euphrasy and rue ; they see far other things than the multitude, and see them vanishing into the unknown. With the outward framework, the voting-booths, platforms, printing-presses, the railroads and telegraphs, they have no quarrel ; why should they quarrel with means which may be turned to good or bad ? Their disquietude is concerned with the ends which all this great machinery subserves. Will it make man less animal and more human ? Will it lead him on to perfection ? Is it intended to bring out in him the divine character which lies implicit and undeveloped in his heart his mind, his spirit ? Or is it not already robbing him of the excellent things to which, by so long and fearful a *Via Crucis*, he had, in principle at least, attained ? These questions may be touched as with a flaming fire, until they glow with heat and passion ; or the calm philosopher may disguise them in terms of his craft ; and so they shall pass unregarded. But they are the true questions of our time, knocking at many a breast, whispering in the drowsy ear of pleasure and drawing to themselves the anxious interest of many who for themselves desire no good which must be purchased by the evil of their fellows.

The supreme problem is not to lose religion. Now we know well that in order to preserve or restore it, we must view the enterprise in its length and breadth, nor imagine that the brunt of the battle

will be fought inside the walls of a church, in the pulpit, and not among the people themselves. We grant that it was not by preaching any abstract system merely, or, for the most part, that secularism has taken to itself the power it wields. In a thousand ways, by means of art, literature, criticism, by sympathy and association, by carrying its principles into the details of life, and, above all, by a firm faith in them to which its practice corresponded, has this modern religion, which is no religion, come to rule over us. A handful at first, these men and women, from Rousseau to George Eliot, have made disciples by the charm of their writing; by the passion they threw into it; by claiming as their own the larger, grander views of things; by awakening enthusiasm in the young; by a dexterous yet self-deluding employment of the names and watchwords that will always find an echo in human hearts; by insisting that they were in the van of progress, and were marching to the promised land. They have even, shall we dare to say it, turned its own cannon against the Christian host. For how else are we to understand the battle cries of the revolution, its liberty, equality, and fraternity, except as stolen from the Gospel and hurled into the face of a social order which every day rehearsed this creed and every hour was trampling it into the mire? That shameful hypocrisy well deserved the punishment of fire and sword which fell upon it. What must be our feeling at any time when anointed prelates have grown to be indistinguishable from great secular lords, and serve the world instead of the altar? When even a Christophe de Beaumont will not so much as eat with a priest of plebeian birth; or what when we see Christian laymen in the height of luxury, while on every side of them thousands are crying for bread, for light, for a little human consideration at their hands? Once more, shall we be astonished that the stones of the street have a voice put into them, and the roar of the barricades is heard over them, so long as no effectual word of condemnation issues from the sanctuary, although mammon has dethroned Christ, and the rule of the market is confessedly a murderous lust of gain? If religion had made a truce with its old enemy, and the Sermon on the Mount were out of date, "Welcome!" we should not shrink from exclaiming, "welcome the satire and reproaches even of infidels, which might compel us to do homage before our own principles, and to uphold the truths we were forgetting." Positivism will always end in the worship of wealth and pleasure, but its polemics have been thundered against a degenerate Christendom, which flouted the beatitudes and did not believe in them.

The state of things which has continued during the last hundred years, though full of alarm and trouble, is not without pre-

cedent. We may travel back as far as twenty-six centuries ago, and we shall hear the noblest of the Old Testament prophets announcing, not only the law, but the method whereby the Keeper of Israel chastises, in order that He may convert, His people. When the pitiless heathen power of Assyria was marching against Jerusalem, and many oracular persons declared that it was impossible the Lord's house should be laid waste, they were told to see in these idolators and blasphemers the instrument which the Almighty had chosen for His purpose. Since priest and prophet alike were neglecting their high mission; since they prophesied smooth things, and suggested compromises, and sat in the feasts of usurers, and looked on in silence while the heritage of the laboring man went to swell the estates of nobles, what was left, humanly speaking, to rouse them from their guilty sleep except that the lightning should descend out of the cloud and smite the very Temple? All was to be taken away which could bind them to the duties of their office; yet that immense catastrophe wherein they beheld only a ruined kingdom and a covenant destroyed, was, according to the devout interpretation, the new birth of Israel, leading on to a higher and more humane stage of the ideal which it was destined to preserve until Christ should appear.

We, too, shall be stripped of every veil between ourselves and the Gospel, of the network which establishments and prescriptions have woven around us; and in losing much of the past we shall be guided towards the future. But so closely is the Church bound up with an order of things no longer acceptable to the mind of Europe, that in sundering the one from the other agonies like those of death must be endured. Not only so. The assault upon Catholicism has well-nigh brought down civilization to the ground. It is not a small or insignificant party which would sweep away the remembrance of history and antiquity, Greeks and Romans, classic and mediæval, in the spirit of those Nihilists to whom nothing is sacred that was standing yesterday. Hence, on the other hand, many who are conscious of the deep principle contained in the word "Evolution," and who feel with Shakespeare that man is "made and moulded of things past," even while he moves on to the heights beyond him, have been anxiously inquiring whether from the wreck of religion, as they speak, any flotsam or jetsam may still be saved. We do not call it a wreck, in spite of the heartrending statistics of our modern cities; but the question comes home to us, and we ask, in turn, whether, by the general acknowledgment of reformers and revolutionists, there do not exist in the Catholic Church treasures which mankind are in every way bound to preserve, and by the loss of which all would be affected? These, then, we may put forward as the human claims, or the re-

wards and inducements whereby we recommend ourselves to a generation that must be taught the difference between religion and fanaticism, if it is not to pass us by disdainfully to its own lasting hurt.

We begin with what is greatest and has already won a marvellous recognition—we mean the Catholic idea of worship; our ritual, liturgy, and public prayer. Not insisting, for the moment, on those divine realities which, as Catholics maintain, are exhibited and brought down to us by means of these sacred rites, we would point out how men of the most opposite temperaments, and not inclined to judge our political system leniently, have yet concurred in viewing the Catholic forms of worship, and the associations they body forth, as alone adequate, or even adapted, to unite mankind in the presence of the Eternal, as being full of reverence, majesty, and sweetness, no less sublime than they are affecting, at once highly poetical and most impressively real, and at this day unapproachable by deliberate imitation on the part of moderns, though genius should inspire it. The only altar round which the children of Adam will be gathered, if any at all, say these far-sighted thinkers, is that on which the sacrifice of the Mass shall be duly lifted up. By the immense void which was left on its abolition, the Catholic Liturgy has proved even to Puritans and Nonconformists how just a claim it possessed on the spirit, as well as the imagination, of our race. To cherish, nay, to preserve the religious life, by preaching within the bare walls from which every token, symbol, and gracious ordinance of the Lord Incarnate had been rudely thrust out, is now seen to be an impossibility. The people are not content with preaching, and they have risen up and flocked into the street rather than endure a deadly formalism which had neither comeliness nor grace to make it winning in their sight. Was it the main purpose of Luther, Knox, and Calvin to set up what they called a spiritual religion, in which the pulpit overshadowed the altar, nay, in which altar and sacrifice were to be thought an abomination? They have made the trial, and it is a disastrous failure. Though the dogmas of the Church be called in question, its high religious symbolism, which, even more than its dogmas, stirred up the bitter wrath of the first Protestants, has subdued their children in spite of themselves. It is finding a welcome in the courts from which it might have seemed forever excluded; and the heart of Christianity is known to be that Apostolic Liturgy of which the fiercest blasphemies were spoken, as we now perceive, in vain.

Let us endeavor to sketch, though in mere outline, the view which this great change is opening before us. Even thoughtful Catholics may be slow to realize how much it implies. First of

all, it is an admission that, unless the religious instinct ceases to exert on human nature the influence allotted to it during thousands of years, it must, for civilized man, take the form of Catholicism. Again, the method of private judgment, by which every one was not only encouraged, but commanded, to set out on a voyage of discovery in search of the true religion, as though it were a problematic country which might, or might not, exist beyond the waves, is now tacitly abandoned. For while disputes concerning speculative theology, or the essentials of the faith, do, by their very nature, continue as long as any two men choose to argue about them, a public liturgy is like the sun in heaven; we need only to open our eyes, and we at once must confess it to be a fact beyond the reach of skepticism. But, in the next place, ritual carries with it the very ideal and reality of the Church, whose living expression, language and worship it has always been. For as no prophecy is of private interpretation, in like manner, no sacrament or sacrifice goes back simply to the individual. The caprice, or fancy, or superstition, the freaks of a restless imagination, the sickly dreams and changeable notions in which a man left to himself will indulge, have nothing in common with so public and fixed a ceremonial—itsself coming down through the ages—which is every one's inheritance, and is at all times as plain to touch and sight as the monuments of Rome or Egypt. By this one stroke the clouds and phantoms of a "subjective" religion which have filled our atmosphere since the Reformation are swept away; we come into contact with a whole range of glorious realities, not demanding at every moment to be proved and proved afresh, lest they melt into thin air, like so many delusions of the visionary. These abide even when we are not thinking of them, and as often as we turn our gaze that way, they meet us in all their clear outline and solid substance. The task, so much beyond our faculties, of each one building up for himself a spiritual realm, and, by a miracle of reason, selecting the right elements amid the chaos round about him, is now taken from off our shoulders. Instead of retreating within ourselves, and from the depths of consciousness evolving a great comprehensive scheme in which God as well as man, and life no less than death and immortality, shall have their due place, we are told to look out, to mark where the Christian altar is erected, and to join in the common rites which, circling through the seasons and embracing every state of humanity from childhood to old age, exhibit and perpetuate all that is most ancient, sacred, solemn and mysterious in the history of the world. What else is this than to reinstate tradition as the vehicle and the guardian of religious faith? Is it not the same thing as relegating mere speculation to the only place it can reasonably

claim (the second, and not the first) distinctly on the ground that a living system, or synthesis, an objective and real organism, never has sprung out of analytic formulas, but must be planted on the rock of history, and is something which we may and ought to take hold of, but ourselves have no power to create? The fact of Christianity is, then, by this remarkable change of view, declared to be identical with Catholicism as an objective system; and they can henceforth no more be divided than by definitive form, the things in which it is realized, and without which it would be an empty sound. "Oh rerum mira conversio," we may well exclaim with Vincent of Lerins. For who could have predicted that in the development of Bible criticism, on the one hand, as of social economics on the other, and yet again, by sheer reaction from the dryness and dreariness of interminable preaching, Europeans would have been brought round again to conceive of the Church as necessarily both real and visible, not, as so many religious liberals and public men have dreamt, a matter of the private conscience only, but much more, a people, a society, even a kingdom, like that Israel from which it is historically descended? If the liturgy is a response to human needs deeply felt, and alone has the power of making those chords vibrate within our hearts, which must else remain forever silent, or discourse mere broken harmonies, it follows that Catholicism will endure, that its function and dignity are assigned to it in the nature of things as they now stand, and that to leave it out of account would be, in the language of Pericles, as though the spring were taken out of the year.

Neither, be it observed, does this argument plead simply for the poetical grace and inspiration which flow from the Catholic ritual. It aims at something far beyond poetry, in the common way of accepting that word; its scope is the spiritual, the divine or transcendental, the secret and the mystery of the highest life, in which He whom we can neither name worthily nor at all comprehend, lifts us up to Himself, and makes us partakers of his own nature. Yet, unlike the Kantian system, which arrives at things eternal (if, indeed, it does so) by means of a postulate, or of that which it absolutely takes for granted, here we set out from experience, and have no need of postulates. The life is given through these sensible media, these sacraments, these sacred rites, when enacted according to tradition and by the appointed ministers. And it is the Christian life which is thus continued from age to age—a character of the most precise and unmistakable type, not, indeed—let us gratefully own it—stamped, as by some hard mechanism, on those in whom it shines forth, but while varying in detail and circumstance, in the beauty of its manifestation displaying a most delicate and ever fresh regard for the individuality of the men and

women whom it fashions into the one likeness. So that we must either rend this garment, as the Reformers strove to rend it—a thing which, we say, has proved impossible—or recognize it as seamless throughout, woven in a simple piece from top to bottom. The liturgy cannot be divorced from the life; and both make known to us a high and holy discipline, of which the sole justification in history has been a dogmatic creed.

We desire to lay the greatest possible emphasis on the method of recommending our faith which is here indicated. There are those who would rest their apologetics almost on a single syllogism, in which the principle of authority is set up against the anarchy of private judgment; and with them, as we need scarcely observe, we are not in the least quarreling as to the soundness of their procedure. But we would venture to remind them of St. Augustine's famous quotation, "*Trahit sua quemque voluptas*," and of his comment thereupon. "*Non necessitas*," the great teacher exclaims; that is to say, not the compulsion of sovereign power, to which we ungraciously yield, "*sed voluptas; non obligatio, sed delectatio: quanto fortius nos dicere debemus, trahi hominem ad Christum, qui delectatur veritate, delectatur beatitudine, delectatur iustitia, delectatur sempiterna vita quod totum Christus est?*" The appeal to authority, thus clad in the beauty of holiness, and enforced by "admiration, hope and love," as directed to the person of whom all these touching ceremonies are in remembrance, will surely not lose anything of its logical strength because it has also a charm for those to whom logic seems only an artifice, and legal claims, however well established, a challenge to argument rather than the echo of Christ's persuasive words, "*Venite ad me omnes*." Moreover, in beginning our journey where so many are now gathered together, we may hope to lead certain of them onward; our first steps will be along the paths of peace, and, by the mere course of our exposition, we shall be able to undo that fatal error which alone made the heresies of the Reformation plausible. What was it? you ask us. Surely this, we reply, that first comes speculative or systematic theology, and religion next, as a deduction from it. An error, the consequences of which have spread far and wide, not only among those who would own themselves to be Rationalists, but in society at large, and against which even Catholics are by no means carefully on their guard as the pernicious nature of the infection demands.

To speak in the terms of German philosophy, though employing them for our own purpose, we say that we have run the risk of substituting the analytic or logical faculty, the bare prose understanding, in the place of the religious spirit—assuredly not while celebrating our divine mysteries, but when we aim at bringing others



to share in them. Great and happy exceptions may be named; we rejoice to think so; yet who that recalls the long array of controversial and even devotional works written, for example, during the eighteenth century, and still popular in many circles, will deny that the impression left by such is abstract and dreamy as compared with the living power and the tender grace which are characteristic of the Imitation, the hymns and sequences of Adam of St. Victor, and the lives of mediæval saints, whether hermits, like Felix of Valois, or warriors, like St. Louis, or statesmen, like St. Bernard and Innocent III.? Well, we are endeavoring to bring out the applicability of an old Catholic principle to our present circumstances, and we suggest that argument is one thing and faith another; that, however true it may be, as, of course, it is, that discussion has its uses, still the most convincing evidence for Christianity is not a chain of syllogisms, nor is it even the need, imperative though it be, of a supreme authority in matters of religion. It is, at last, the Divine Life made manifest in our worship, our practice and our teaching in a concrete tangible shape, which shall be commensurate with the intelligence of the people and, if we may venture so to express ourselves, obvious to their senses and delightful or subduing to their imagination.

Let us make allowance for human nature in those whom we address, if not in ourselves, not reducing the credentials we bring with us to one bare and gaunt syllogism, as though some exquisite Greek statue had been suddenly transformed into its own anatomy. Are all logicians? Do all find inexhaustible pleasure in tracing the connection of ideas? or is it wise to show them authority as frowning anathemas on the disobedient ere we have convinced them that its delight is not at all in anathemas, but in keeping watch over the previous things of the gospel transmitted to its charge? If we can make them feel the attraction of which St. Augustine speaks, the rest is easy, "Da amantem, et sentit quod dico, da desiderantem, da esurientem." That is the miracle which no syllogisms could have wrought, and now the number of those that hunger and thirst after life, that have grown weary of rationalizing and the individual fancies which leave them in the wilderness, seems to be growing day by day. Abstract discussion will neither heal nor enlighten them; what they need is Revelation, and this again not as a series of formulas in terms beyond their capacity, but on the plain and simple method which the teaching of the Master suggests, in parable, history and sacrament. How can we prove that it is precisely this, and not any kind of scholasticism, which our generation will find most suitable to the frame of mind in which it has grown up? We turn to the epistles of one who was called to teach their like in his day, and I hear him saying, "But

if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God and report that God is in you of a truth." The prophesying which is here described as its own evidence may now be regarded as coextensive with the whole service of the Church and with that affirmative or explanatory preaching—at the very opposite pole from controversial arguments—by means of which an interpretation of the sacred things shown or done is furnished to our people. This we conceive to be the revelation "with power" which St. Paul distinguishes from the "enticing words of man's wisdom" and sets forth as the "demonstration of the Spirit." Not, again we say, that there is no room for the severest processes of reasoning without a particle of sentiment in the schools of Christian theology. My contention, however, is that comparatively few have either the inclination or the gifts which would enable them to rely on such methods when coming to the Church, and that the way of Providence is much more on the level, that power is attached to ordinances, and that these more impressively than the most eloquent of controversial discourses do show forth "the death of the Lord until He come," which is the sum and substance of the message we have been sent to deliver.

It has been repeatedly urged, by such skilled disputants as Joseph De Maistre, Newman and Moehler, that Christianity did not come into the world as an abstract system of philosophy, and that, had it done so, nothing but a miracle would have saved it from the fate which has overtaken other systems. In a few years its place would have known it no more. Is this to deny that principles of the deepest philosophy may be discerned at the foundations of Christendom? Or does it proscribe and forbid intellectual inquiry on the part of those who are qualified to undertake it? By no manner of means. The purpose of all such observations is to open our eyes that we may see the difference between schemes made up of mere formulas and a religion which discourses to the faithful not formulas but objects, and those in their nature heavenly and eternal; or, to put the same truth from another point of view, we are not to imagine that the New Testament has completely broken with the Old, as if, whilst the children of Israel enjoyed a visible communication with their Lord and King, Christians must be satisfied to walk in a path by themselves, every one, indeed, having the Spirit, but no two bearing witness that He dwells in them, nor being permitted to look up to the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, which was the comfort of those who journeyed with the tabernacle through

the desert. There is a perfect harmony in the dealings of the Almighty from first to last. He does not, like a human teacher, set before us reasonings which we may criticise by counter-reasonings or to which, when it seems good in our eyes, we may yield assent. What He reveals is not a mere philosophy nor a system, but Himself, as He declared at the beginning: "I will be what I will be"—that is to say, by a series of Providences, every one of which makes Him better known, He will form to Himself a chosen people, and will thus, in very deed, become their God.

Even such is the manifestation which He has, in these latter days, made of His glory through and in the Son of Man. It is an objective gift, as well as a subjective acquisition. In weight and length and depth it goes far beyond our understanding; we cannot fathom the abysses of the Divine Mercy, and our faith always holds in it more than we shall be able to reckon. Starting from the purely abstract, how are we to arrive at facts in the concrete? The Catholic way is to begin with the facts, as something given, and to demonstrate their reality by the power which comes forth from them, exactly following the method of nature or the instinct in obedience to which we lay hold of the physical world immediately, without stopping to answer the pyrrhotist who warns us that we may be taking a shadow as substance. Now, if it be true that Christianity so began, we argue that on the same principles it is to continue. The method which brought disciples to our Lord is the method which will bring disciples to His church. Ought we, then, to put metaphysical reasonings in the foreground, to open our attack from the clouds, as it were, and to interpose a wide range of discussion, such as the Christian evidences too commonly have been, in the way of those who desire to know something, not of our philosophy but of the life we have to offer them? Shall we prefer the wisdom of Athens, which could not redeem one city from destruction, to the prophetic and divine power as it is experienced in our mysteries? Of course, we should be distressed at the thought of so profound a disloyalty to our Master. Yet we may have given in, more than we suppose, to the methods of that philosophic school which we undertook to overthrow. For, in controversy, as in a duel, there must needs be an agreement to use the same weapons. And those who have surveyed the scholastic quarrels and intricate terminologies of the fourteenth century will assign to them no small share in producing the decay of faith which set in afterwards.

But now, at length, on both sides the true starting-point is coming to be acknowledged. It is not private judgment ranging at will among Divine truths, picking and choosing, here a little and there a little, as if religion were a patchwork and the Bible an ori-

ental bazaar. No, nor is it the Sacred Volume itself without note or comment; for critical scholarship has made it simply impossible that one man in ten thousand should venture to decide what is and what is not an oracle of Scripture. Nor, in the third place, is it a system of propositions, technical in their wording, abstruse in their significance, and to be proved by an array of long-drawn arguments the like of which may be studied (by those who have abundant leisure) in divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even when one of these systems happened to embody great cardinal truths, as may be the case with Molinism or the later Thomism, still it does not afford the sure and solid ground on which we must take our stand—it is not religion, but philosophy; it shows us man's thought about God, not God revealing himself to man; Revelation is the starting-point, but that revelation made real, present and effective in a life the centre of which is Divine ordinance, the power of which was long ago summed up in a single word, Emmanuel—"God with us." Before that veiled and awful majesty the systems of mortal man fall silent; there is no word which they can utter in the sanctuary, helpful and seasonable though they may prove outside those sacred gates. For it is the wonderful character of faith to unite gentle and simple, learned and unlearned, in the apprehension of the same Divine Object, each according to his measure, but in a union which the analytic intellect cannot reduce to its own expression. Yet we are by no means suggesting—far from it—that faith is not of the mind as well as of the heart. We hold it to be something spiritual; nor will we consent to deal with the spirit on those modern principles by which it is confounded and lost in a group of sensations or nervous thrills. Our faith is not only rooted in history; it pierces, also through phenomena to their substance, and if even theological science cannot exhaust its contents, the reason is not because faith and feeling are identical, but that science never has been found adequate to the full delineation of personality.

He that divides the letter from the spirit, and looks upon forms—even the most sacred—as an end in themselves, may be termed a Ritualist or Pharisee; while his counterpart (in the style of Plato) is the Rationalist, who sacrifices forms sensible to formulas intellectual, and dissecting the body, banishes the soul which dwelt therein. Neither of them has understood the true quality of life or seen in history by what means the spirit is kept from escaping out of these earthly vessels. Here it is that a right acquaintance with the Bible will guide us straight into the creative secret of the Church. For in the Bible two great powers are seen to be combined, under the head of Providence, towards the final issue, which is Christ abiding as a present Deity among the faith-

ful. These are the priesthood and the prophetic word. May we not regard them as forming together a mysterious sacrament, of which the outward sign was the Aaronic order, but the inward grace prophecy, expressing itself by speech and symbol, and correcting, restraining, enlightening as occasion demanded? The Word was something more than philosophy, and the ordinances, far from being vain or superfluous—though in time to be done away as shadows only of the good things to come—had a virtue in them by which the people of Israel were kept distinct from the heathen. We, likewise, enjoy the “firm prophetic word;” our liturgy is framed almost wholly in the language and coloring proper to it, and that word, again, gives the spirit or sense of all those actions which take place round about our altar. Let it be applied to the phenomena—how complex soever—in which we find ourselves entangled, and we need borrow the wisdom neither of Greek nor German; with its aid we may build up, not empty systems, but a living order of civilization, a code of morals, a philosophy teaching by example, a concrete world that shall be the announcement of the new and heavenly city coming down from above.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that we should aim more and more at making the Catholic Church its own evidence to those without, by showing them what treasures of grace and truth are contained in its ritual, its prophesying, and its spiritual life; in the saints whom it has raised up to minister among the people; in its martyrs of charity and its Christ-like men and women, with their gifts of unwearied zeal and compassion, their tenderness for the suffering, and their immortal and unconquerable hope in God. But likewise to those who are within, many thousands of whom, though they attend its worship and delight in it, do still, as if their eyes were holden, fail to realize which, and how great, are the chief riches of the sanctuary; some fixing their enthusiasm upon passing and ephemeral inventions, luxuries rather than necessities of the heavenly life; others careless of the beautiful things which are their inheritance, and disdaining, not merely the barbarism of past ages but their religious art, their traditions of hieratic decorum, their contemplative spirit, as though we could preserve the central rites of Christianity, while refusing to share in the thoughts and feelings of those to whom we are indebted for them.

If Chateaubriand could say, ninety years ago, that controversy must change its method in order to persuade a new generation, and instead of proving our religion to be admirable because it comes from God, must rather show that it comes from God because it is admirable, he did not mean, nor do we, that Christians should practice a vulgar eclecticism, snatching at the fancies of the day

and endeavoring to outbid revolutionaries or secularists in their own auction. His counsel was that men should be persuaded to look at the reality instead of arguing about it, a reality which in its nature is the greatest of historical facts, and not merely one set of opinions among many. Let us prove, he said, that of all the religions which have ever been known, Christianity—and with Novalis we subjoin that Catholicism is nothing else than Christianity made concrete—that this religion is the most poetical and humane, the most encouraging to liberty, the arts, and literature; that our modern world owes everything to it, from the culture of its fields to the abstract sciences, from hospitals for the suffering to the lofty temples designed by Michael Angelo and adorned by Raffaello. We must show, as we readily can, how sublime is its moral discipline, how high and yet attractive its spiritual truths; we must urge upon men, with the page of history to warrant us, that Catholicism has fostered genius, given a manly vigor to the mind, awakened the passion of philanthropy, suggested noble forms to the poet, and inspired the artist; that while it has ever upheld the principle of order and recognized in lawful authority the very voice of God, it may justly claim to have spread throughout the world a free democracy, in which the children of the lowliest might rise by their merit to the chair of St. Peter, and women like St. Catharine of Siena, St. Theresa, and St. Gertrude might exercise, though not a priestly yet a prophetic office, while their less gifted sisters became ministering angels to the sick, the poor, the afflicted, and the forsaken. Nor is it a slight argument to point out that where the Catholic Church has been exiled the arts and the charities have taken flight in her train. The force of the contrast is, indeed, overpowering when we set the dismal centuries of Protestantism in the light of the Catholic civilization, with its feeling for all that is beautiful, heroic, and supernatural. That divine sanctuary which we have called the heart of our religion, when it broadened out and its boundaries took in the peoples of Europe, contained, as in some luminous and unfallen world, cities, temples, monasteries, sweet silent solitudes, and busy marts, and homes of peace, and everywhere displayed the riches of an inspiring and inspired existence. Its breath was poetry; its spirit was self-denial; its hope was in the Eternal.

How is all that changed as we look on the armed and industrial slavery which sums up the tale of modern life! When the holy place was desecrated and the altar overthrown, speedily the wilderness, which had been cleared, began to conquer again. We have to deal with an immense and fast-growing population before whose eyes no spiritual vision is unfolded—to which the true human and Christian motives of conduct are as strange as if they

had never been preached—heathens that do not worship even the gods of Paganism, and who have scarcely a suspicion that man was meant for something better than to gratify his appetites or to sell himself in the labor market. What is our message to them? We must take them with the cords of Adam, by multiplying in the midst of them that presence of Christ which they have not known; and we must claim for them, on our own principles, whatever is lovely, noble, and elevating in art or nature, drawing all things which are not utterly doomed to perish into the circle of His blessing. How this was accomplished by our forefathers we may learn if we do but contemplate the churches they set up; the ceremonies they have bequeathed to us; their painting, writing, and architecture; the religious orders, with their severe yet beneficent institutions; and all that is truly characteristic of such creative minds as St. Benedict, St. Gregory VII., and St. Francis of Assisi. The splendid and touching poetry of Dante will let us into the secret which kindled their genius, while in Shakespeare we view, as in a clear fresco, the more wordly aspects of mediæval greatness; and how astonishing it is that they could unite such depths of mystery with a quick-feeling, romantic, and gay, yet turbulent, existence. The truth is, that religion intensified their emotions as it enlarged their being. A pulse of immortality was beating in these mortal veins, and faith had already begun to chant the divine epithalamium, or marriage song, of heaven and earth.

Our situation is different, nor so promising. For the Church in Europe has now to defend what remains erect rather than she is permitted to carry out her own design of establishing God's law in righteousness. And defence is well known to be far more difficult than to assail, or even, I will add, to create from the beginning.

In America, where the mediæval order has never existed, the task of Catholicism should be more hopeful because the ground is comparatively clear. But east or west of the Atlantic it will always be true that the Church is the centre of the ages, the link between times past and times to come; not so ancient that she cannot adapt herself to altered circumstances, nor so forgetful of her origin as to descend from her place and be lost in the crowd of modern innovators. If, on looking back over her long history, we observe that Origen, and Clement of Alexandria, and Augustine wrote under Platonic inspiration; that the schoolmen were indebted to the Arabians; that to St. Thomas Aquinas the Greek Aristotle is the master of those that know; or again, that the Renaissance, despite its serious moral shortcomings and heathen temper, was treated more than indulgently by austere saints who

venerated Savonarola yet did not share in his iconoclastic zeal, we can still discern, amid so much variety, a sameness of texture, and an overruling spirit, and an essence unchangeable, in virtue of which Catholicism never was simply an echo of Plato, Aristotle, or the Humanists, but something always at one with itself, distinct, and supernatural. What an energy, what a life, must have existed within her not to be transmuted and altogether dissolved by such potent influences, some of which her wisest teachers withstood on this very ground that their triumph would be almost her extinction? Yet she was able to absorb, to assimilate, and even to turn them, as in the case of the Hellenic poets and philosophers, to her own advantage. A lesson, surely, for us who are called upon to handle the multifarious products of the world in our day. But we shall not succeed as our fathers did unless we take the course laid down by them, not being led away as if disciples of new philosophies, or specious literatures, or aspiring economic systems, but criticizing all these on the standard furnished to us in the creed of which we make daily confession. Neither ought we so far to misread our own principles as, even for the sake of controversial victory, to invert the divine order of things, whether by attributing to mere abstract arguments a grace that attends on the prophetic word, or by losing sight in our disputations of the concrete ordinances which, rather than systems of technical reasoning, are our strength and our attraction. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" is the teaching of the Evangelist. If, at any time, instead of that most human and loving figure, we invite men to contemplate the "*idola theatri*" of our own devising, notions and schemes, or theories or philosophies, deduced, by some subtle sleight of hand, from the New Testament, but still not the Gospel in its living traditional form, let us not be amazed though men, who are satiated with the reformers' wordy battles, decline to make a second experiment in the same kind. We must begin with facts if we would end with faith. Even the truest analytic philosophy, though it be sound as far as it goes, never did more than predispose some to hope that Christianity might be credible. To believe, they must be brought face to face with its Supreme Object.

WILLIAM BARRY.



## Scientific Chronicle.

### ESSENTIAL OILS.

#### MANUFACTURE—PROPERTIES--USES.

IN the October number of this REVIEW we gave some account of the more important true (fixed or fatty) oils. We saw that they are mixtures of a set of well-defined chemical compounds of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, and that, from their very composition, they can be readily distinguished from all other substances. This is not the case with the essential oils. Among these a great many are pure hydrocarbons, *i.e.*, compounds of hydrogen and carbon only; others contain oxygen in addition, others again sulphur, and a few nitrogen. Nor are they built up on any special plan that we can clearly recognize. Of course, each oil is a definite chemical compound, or at least a mixture of such compounds, but an inspection of the formula will fail to lead us to a definition, and without that we can hardly hope to be happy. Moreover, we find among these oils, as in some other cases of chemical compounds, the curious phenomenon of isomerism, that is, cases in which bodies are made up of the same elements in the same proportions, and which nevertheless differ very widely from each other in their physical, and even in their chemical properties. When we fall in with these cases, we say that the arrangement of the atoms in the molecule must be different, just as, in an analogous way, from the same number of bricks, and blocks of granite or marble, of the same size, we may, by varying the grouping, build a church, or a palace, a mausoleum, a fort, or a mill-dam, etc. This phenomenon of isomerism gives us but little trouble, but in the matter of defining the term "essential oil," it must be sorrowfully confessed that the chemists have so far left us in a pretty bad muddle. No clear definition has as yet been concocted; and even classification, which is needed as a stepping-stone to a definition, would seem rather less satisfactory than the order of the indiscriminate rubbish of a garret, or of the odds and ends in a forty-year-old junk shop.

Why then do we call them "oils" at all: It is surely not because they *are* oils, for they are *not*, but because our venerated ancestors called them so in ages past, and "a name lives on forever." But this does not teach us how to recognize them. It does not tell us how to put our index-finger *here* and say: "This substance is an essential oil;" or *there* and say: "This other one is not." It is true that they have some properties in common, some links to bind them together, but these do not always seem to divide them sharply from certain other substances which are not essential oils, nor group them clearly under any one head. You may search the standard lexicons, the encyclopædias, the larger works on chemistry, and even the *ex professo* treatises on oils, and yet you will

probably end in a mist. You will find in one place, as a negative characteristic, that they are neither acid nor alkaline. True, but that does not distinguish them from the alcohols and ethers, and many other neutral bodies, not the least important among which is water. In another place it will be stated that they do not saponify, or form soaps with the alkalies. True again, but neither do a great many other bodies, molasses for example, and Jamaica Rum. Again, we are told that they are not unctuous to the touch : but neither is chalk nor sandpaper. Turning to positive characteristics, the first one given is, that essential oils are all volatile, that is, at a proper temperature, they pass from the solid or liquid to the gaseous condition. Here again we are brought up with a jerk, for many other substances are equally volatile, as iodine, sulphur, mercury, etc. The next is that they have strong odors. Verily, they often have ; but so have other things which no one, chemist or otherwise, would ever dream of calling essential oils, such things, for example, as chlorine, bromine, and sulphuretted and phosphoretted hydrogen. A third is that they are highly inflammable. So are carbon disulphide, and nitro-glycerine, and gunpowder. A fourth that their flame is densely smoky. So is that of paper, hay, sawdust, and the like.

We have given these characteristics of the essential oils in this apparently unfair way, precisely because we have never found them all together in any one work. Some authors give one or two, some give another one or two, but it is evident from what has been said just above, that this is not sufficient. Let us then sum it all up, and say that an essential oil is a body which possesses *all* of these characteristics, positive as well as negative, and not merely a part of them chosen at random. The thing to be done then is to go at the business by a process of elimination. Thus, an essential oil must be :

1. *Volatile*.—This throws out nitro-glycerine, gunpowder, terra cotta, cabbages, and a whole world of other things besides.

2. *Strongly odorous*.—This eliminates from the list, water, carbonic dioxide, etc.

3. *A compound body*.—By this condition, all the elementary substances however odorous or volatile they may be, are left out.

4. *Inflammable and burn with a smoky flame*. This rids us of alcohol, ether, carbon disulphide, and the like.

5. *Neutral*.—Hence, ammonia and all the acids, however volatile or odorous they may chance to be, are barred out.

6. *Non-saponifiable, and not unctuous to the touch*. This shuts off all the true oils and fats, soapstone and plumbago.

If we have not gotten *over* the difficulty, we may perhaps modestly claim to have gotten *around* it. By combining these six points, we may perhaps come to the not unwise conclusion, that an essential oil is something that cannot be classed as anything else, a sort of a chemical tramp, as it were, that is refused admission everywhere, but yet whose existence cannot be ignored. To the one who prides himself on being always rigidly logical and exact, this may not be highly satisfactory, but for the present it seems to be about the best that can be done.

It must not be understood, however, that there is any dispute in practice, about the fact that such and such bodies will invariably be called "essential oils" by everybody, while such and such others will not, even though the *why* of the thing be as elusive as a freshly-caught eel, or the smile on the face of a village clock. They constitute an extensive and very important class of substances without which this world would, in some respects, be a dull and sorry world. The perfumes of all our plants and flowers, as well as of all animal substances, the aromas of all our spices, balsams, resins, and fragrant gums, the savor of all our condiments, the flavor of all our cordials and liqueurs, the bouquet of all our wines, whether from the grape or from other fruits, the special savor, or taste, which serves to distinguish one distilled liquor from another, as in rum, brandy, gin, whiskey, and whatever others there may be, and from whatever sources they may be derived, are all due to the different kinds of essential oils which either exist as such in the fruit or grain, or are developed in the process of manufacture. But the rôle of the essential oils does not end with the mere ornamental fringes of life and its pleasures, for they are useful, necessary even, in more than one of the arts and industries. They are needed in the manufacture of paints, varnishes and lacquers. And what would we do without lacquers and varnishes to preserve our metal and wood work, and paint, to cover up our bad carpentering? Many of these oils are also extensively and successfully used in the practice of medicine.

They are called "essential oils," or "essences," because they possess, in a concentrated form, the peculiar virtues of the substances from which they are extracted. They are called "volatile oils" for the reason already given. "Distilled oils," because they may be obtained by distillation. And "spirits" . . . well . . . perhaps because "now you've got 'em, and now again you haven't."

#### ORIGIN OF ESSENTIAL OILS.

The inorganic world furnishes us with but one essential oil, viz., petroleum, called also rock oil and mineral oil; but even that, doubtlessly, came originally from the vegetable kingdom, just as our mineral coal did. The subject of petroleum would be too long to handle here.

The animal kingdom supplies us with a few substances whose peculiar odors are ascribed to essential oils, though these have never yet been isolated. We shall say a few words about them a little later on. By far the larger part of the essential oils are obtained from the vegetable kingdom. They exist in a vast number of plants, and occur sometimes in one part of the plant, sometimes in another, and sometimes in several parts of the plant at the same time. Thus, in the rose, the violet, and several others, the essential oil is found only in the flowers; in the nutmeg it is in the fruit; in the clove, it is in the unexpanded bud; in the cinnamon we find three distinct oils, one in the leaves, one in the bark, and one in the root; the orange furnishes two, one from the flowers, the other from the rind of the fruit; in the geranium, the oil

is principally in the leaves; both the leaves and the stems of the peppermint and the pennyroyal contain an oil; in the ginger, it is mostly in the root; in the cedar, the sandal, and some other woods, it saturates the whole tree.

The oils are generally enclosed in special cells, or cavities, or glands, which are sometimes visible to the unaided eye, as in the leaves of the mint and the rind of the orange. At times they lead a monastic life, all alone, but frequently they contain resins in solution; and in that case the mixture, if liquid, is called an "oleo-resin"; if semi-liquid, a "balsam"; if solid, simply a "resin." In a few cases the oil is not actually present in the plant itself, but is produced by the mutual action of inodorous substances when these are brought together in the presence of water. An example of this is the essential oil of bitter almonds, and probably also that of mustard. Essential oils are rarely soluble to any marked degree in water, but they dissolve readily in alcohol, ether, chloroform, fatty oils, and mineral oil. They mix in all proportions with one another.

#### EXTRACTION OF ESSENTIAL OILS.

In order to extract the essential oils easily and thoroughly, it is often necessary to put the raw materials through a previous preparation. It is evident that different methods will have to be employed for this end, according to the nature and condition of those materials. If the material be wood, it must be comminuted sufficiently to allow the oil to escape; and though at times it will suffice to have it in the form of shavings, yet it is always better, and, in the case of the harder woods, it is absolutely necessary to get it into the form of sawdust. An attempt to accomplish this by actual hand-sawing, or even by machine-sawing, would clearly prove unsatisfactory. A practical method is to use a fast-revolving, hardened, steel drum, whose surface is a rasp. Against this the wood is pressed, and . . . "whiz" . . . the work is done. To prevent clogging, a slender stream of water is made to play over the surface of the drum.

Roots and woody herbs are passed through a machine resembling in principle the hay-cutter. Nuts, barks, hard seeds, etc., are crushed between rollers, either fluted or smooth, according to circumstances. Flowers need no preparation.

Another important point is the properties of the oils themselves. Thus, an orange-peel will retain the quality of its oil unimpaired, and lose very little in quantity, even when shrivelled up and leathery. Rose leaves, dried in the air, retain a portion at least of their odor for years; but the delicate fragrance of the violet is gone before the leaves are completely wilted; while the water-lily loses its pleasant odor, and acquires an extremely unpleasant one, in the course of a few hours. If the odor is persistent in quantity and quality, we need not be in a hurry, but, to catch the "fleeting breath of the violet," we have no time to lose. For oils of this class, the manufactory must be in the midst of the garden itself. They manage it just so in those parts where

this business is most extensively carried on, as at Grasse, Cannes, and Nice, in France, and at Monaco, in Italy. In these places the plants have been brought to the highest state of perfection, and many hundreds of acres of the best soils are under cultivation for the sole purpose of supplying flowers for the manufacture of volatile oils. In the United States the principal oils produced are those of lavender, peppermint, sassafras, winter-green, and birch, though there seems to be no good reason why many others should not be added to the list.

#### PROCESSES OF EXTRACTION.

There are five distinct methods in use for the extraction of the essences of plants, viz. :

1. Expression, either by hand or by machinery.
2. Distillation.
3. Solution.
  - (a) With the aid of heat, but without pressure.
  - (b) With the aid of pressure, but without heat.
4. Maceration.
5. Absorption.
  - (a) In the cold.
  - (b) With the help of hot air, or other gas.

Frequently a combination of two or more of these processes is necessary in order to reach the desired result.

#### I. PROCESS OF EXPRESSION.

This method is available only when the substances are especially rich in oil and of sufficient softness, as is the case with the rind of the orange, the lemon, the citron, etc. On a small scale the work is done by hand. Two hand processes are thus described by Dr. Hanbury :

"The workman first cuts off the peel in three longitudinal slices, leaving the central pulp of a three-cornered shape with a little peel at either end. This central pulp he cuts transversely in the middle, throwing it on one side and the pieces of peel on the other. The latter are allowed to remain till the next day and are then treated thus: The workman, seated, holds in the palm of his left hand a flattish piece of sponge, wrapping it round his forefinger. With the other he places on the sponge one of the slices of peel, the outer surface downwards, and then presses the zest-side (which is uppermost) so as to give it for the moment a convex instead of a concave form. The vesicles are thus ruptured, and the oil which issues from them is received in the sponge with which they are in contact. Four or five squeezes are all the workman gives to each slice of peel, which done he throws it aside. Though each bit of peel has attached to it a small portion of pulp, the workman contrives to avoid pressing the latter. As the sponge gets saturated the workman wrings it forcibly, receiving its contents in a coarse earthen bowl which is capable of holding at least three pints. In this rude vessel the oil separates from the watery liquid which accompanies it and is then decanted.

"The yield is stated to be very variable. Four hundred fruits affording nine to fourteen ounces of essence. The prisms of pulp and the exhausted pieces of peel are submitted to pressure in order to extract from them lemon juice, and are said to be also subjected to distillation. The foregoing is termed the *sponge process*; it is also applied to the orange. It appears rude and wasteful, but when honestly performed it yields an excellent product.

"Essence of lemon is prepared at Mentone and Nice by a different method. The object being to set free the oil contained in the vesicles of the peel, an apparatus is employed which may be thus described: A stout saucer or shallow basin of pewter about  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches in diameter, with a lip on one side for convenience in pouring. Fixed in the bottom of this saucer are a number of stout, sharp brass pins, standing up about half an inch; the centre of the bottom is deepened into a tube about an inch in diameter and five inches in length, closed at its lower end. This vessel has, therefore, some resemblance to a shallow, dish-shaped funnel, the tube of which is closed below.

"The workman takes a lemon in the hand and rubs it over the sharp pins, turning it round so that the oil vessels of the entire surface may be punctured. The essential oil which is thus liberated is received in the saucer, whence it flows down the tube, and as this latter becomes filled it is poured into another vessel that it may separate from the turbid aqueous liquid that accompanies it. It is finally filtered and is then known as *essence de citron au zeste*."

When large quantities are to be dealt with the fruit is first peeled by hand, and the pulp, which contains no oil, is reserved for other purposes. The peels are then tied up in linen or haircloth bags and subjected to the action of a screw-press, in an iron vessel having a perforated bottom. On a really large scale, and especially when it is thought worth while to exhaust the peel completely, hydraulic pressure must be used. The turbid, milky fluid so obtained consists of volatile oil, water holding extractive substances and salts in solution, and finally divided cell substance which was forced through the meshes of the cloth. This seemingly unpromising mixture is allowed to stand in tall, narrow glass jars for several days, at the end of which time it is found to have separated into three distinct layers. The lowest is a slimy deposit of cell substance, the next a clear layer of the aqueous solution of extractive matters, salts and vegetable albumen. The third is the layer of oil, which, being the lightest, floats on the top. A lateral neck with a stop-cock near the bottom of the jar affords the means of drawing off, first, the sediment and watery fluid and afterwards the oil; but the end is not yet. The oil still contains impurities in the shape of vegetable fibres too minute to be seen even with the aid of a good lens, but yet capable of imparting a slight opalescence to the fluid. If this solid vegetable matter were allowed to remain, it would, by decomposing, soon ruin the odor of the oil. Its removal is effected either by filtration or by distillation.

These essences being often so sensitive that prolonged contact with

the air is injurious, special precautions in the process of filtering must be taken to prevent such contact as much as possible. For this purpose the bottle into which the oil is to be filtered is provided with a cork having two holes. In one of these the neck of the funnel fits; in the other a short piece of glass tubing. On the top of the funnel, whose upper rim is ground true, a cover is fitted air-tight by means of a rubber ring. Through the cover passes another piece of glass tubing, which is to be connected with the one in the cork by a rubber tube of convenient length. The filter paper and a charge of oil having been placed in the funnel, the cover is adjusted and the filtering begins. The only air which can now come in contact with the oil is what is contained in the bottle and funnel, and its virtue for mischief is soon exhausted. The books tell us that the cover must not be lifted except for the purpose of pouring more oil into the funnel. We think we can suggest an improvement here. Thus: Provide a second funnel having a stop-cock in its neck and fit it air-tight into the cover of the first. When it is time to replenish the lower funnel, fill the upper one with oil, open its stop-cock and slip off one end of the rubber tube and the oil will descend and fill the lower funnel. Then close the stop-cock and replace the rubber tube, and instead of a fresh quantity of air having been admitted, a part of what was in will have been expelled and the filtering will be continuous as long as oil and bottles hold out. Patent not applied for. After the oil has been carefully filtered, it is stored in well-stoppered bottles, in a cool, dark place. When, for the complete purification of an expressed oil, it is preferred to have recourse to distillation, the oil is mixed with a little water and transferred to a "still," as described below.

## 2. PROCESS OF DISTILLATION.

Perhaps we ought to take it for granted that everybody knows what is meant by a "still," and yet this article would be incomplete without a few words at least of description. A still consists essentially of two parts, the "body" and the "worm," or "condenser." In the first the substance to be distilled is brought, by means of heat, to the gaseous state, while in the other it is re-condensed to the liquid, and in some few instances to the solid form.

The first part of the operation is effected either by the direct application of fire to the body of the still, or indirectly by means of pipes through which steam is made to pass, or, again, by causing live steam under considerable pressure, say from 50 to 100 pounds per square inch, to pass directly into the body of the still itself and so through the substances contained therein. By this last means any volatile matter in the substances operated on will be taken up and carried along by the steam in its course. In the case of the essential oils, the use of a direct fire is not to be recommended, as it tends to impart to them a burnt or scorched odor. If there is question merely of purifying an oil which has already been extracted by "expression" or otherwise, then the indirect method, of heating the still by steam, is the one to be preferred.

The *rationale* of the purification is in this, that the oil is volatilized and so passes into the "condenser," while the solid impurities remain behind in the water. In fact, the water was added precisely to allow the solid matters a place in which to settle without getting scorched. If the temperature be kept below  $212^{\circ}$  F., very little, if any, of the water will pass over. Purification by distilling is, in general, called "*rectification*."

But if, on the other hand, there is question of extracting the volatile principles from the plants themselves, then the sending of a current of steam through the substances to be operated upon has the advantage. To accomplish this a perforated false-bottom is fitted inside the body of the still; on this the comminuted substance is placed, and the steam is made to enter below and pass up through the mass till the latter is completely exhausted. A neat contrivance for work on a small scale is to have a still with two bodies, one above the other, with only a narrow opening between them, and then use the lower one as a boiler, while the upper one serves as the "still" proper.

The second part of the operation, the condensation of the volatilized oil, is brought about by causing the oil to pass through a suitable length of tubing, cooled down below the liquifying temperature of the oil. This tubing is kept cool by being encased in a vessel in which cold water, the colder the better, is kept constantly flowing. When a long condensing tube is required it is coiled around, for the sake of compactness, in the form of an open helix, and is then called the "worm." The condensing tube should not be of iron on account of the rust which would be formed and carried along, thus producing discoloration of the oil; but copper and pure block-tin and, for small operations, glass are eminently suitable.

Of course, the steam, as well as the oil, is re-condensed, but the two liquids will usually separate, on standing, into distinct layers in the collecting vessel, and can be drawn off successively. The layer of water will, however, always contain a little of the oil in solution. But this water need not be lost, for it may be used for the rectification of other oils of the same kind, or it may be generously donated to friends or to "hangers-on." Many other points, useful and necessary to the manufacturer, might be touched on here, but we think we have said enough for the edification of those who are not in the business.

### 3. PROCESS OF SOLUTION.

(a) With the aid of heat but without pressure.

The volatile oils, though but slightly soluble in water, are usually quite soluble in ether, chloroform, carbon-disulphide, petroleum ether, alcohol, etc. In principle the process of solution is simple enough. The raw materials are given a long warm-bath, or soaking, in one or other of the foregoing solvents, by which means their oil is dissolved out and remains in the solvent. The fluid so obtained is then distilled at a very moderate heat; the solvent, passing over first, is re-condensed and saved to be used again, while the essential oil remains behind in the still.



This oil is, however, far from being pure, containing, as it does, dissolved resins, extractive matters, and coloring substances. For rectification a little water is added to the oil in the still, and the temperature is raised till the oil goes over, when it is re-condensed and collected, just as already described under the head of "Distillation."

In the employment of this process very great care must be exercised to guard against fire. The vapors of most of the solvents are heavier than air, and hence are not readily dissipated, but tend to collect around the apparatus. As they are extremely inflammable, no fire nor naked light of any kind should be allowed to come near the still.

(*b*) With the assistance of pressure, but without heat.

With increased pressure the essential oils can be extracted even at ordinary temperature, by means of one or other of the solvents mentioned above. The extracting vessel is set up in the lower story of the building. It must be made of stout metal, and be carefully put together. It is provided with a perforated false bottom, on which a proper quantity of the raw material is loosely spread. In the centre of the true bottom a tube and stop-cock is fixed. The vessel is provided with a conical cover, which can be firmly clamped in place. A metal tube, that can be uncoupled at will, rises from the centre of the cover through the building, to a height of at least forty feet, where it ends in a funnel-shaped top. (Some people seem to have been rashly thrust into this world without a proper *quantum* of mechanical instinct. If that vertical pipe were made to enter through the side of the vessel, near the top, the pressure would be just as great as in the other way, and the cover could be taken off, and replaced again, without disturbing the pipe, and without running the risk of starting any leaks.) By means of the funnel, the apparatus is filled to the very top. The pressure exerted by a column of liquid of a given height, will vary according to the density of the liquid; from fifteen to twenty-five pounds per square inch being the usual amount, though a greater pressure would work more rapidly. The effect of the pressure is to force the oil from the oil-cells, and at the same time cause it to be absorbed more rapidly and more completely by the solvent. Having been allowed to stand for a sufficient time, generally from a half-hour to an hour, the solution is drawn off by the stop-cock at the bottom, and rectified as described above.

#### 4. PROCESS OF MACERATION.

This process is employed when the essences are too delicate to stand the heat of distillation. The fixed oils and fats have a great affinity for the essential oils, and the method by which advantage is taken of this property is called "maceration." In practice it is conducted as follows: A convenient quantity of fat is placed in a shallow porcelain, or enamelled-iron pan, over a water-bath. The heat under the bath must be so regulated that the temperature of the fat shall not rise much above its melting-point. Freshly gathered flowers are thrown into the melted fat, and well stirred from time to time for a day or two. The exhausted leaves are then strained out, and fresh ones added, and this process is

repeated from ten to fifteen times, until the fat is well saturated with the volatile oil of the flowers. The resulting product goes by the name of "pomade," the uses of which are well known to our readers.

If, however, the oil itself be wanted, it is extracted from the pomade by strong alcohol, which dissolves the oil, but does not take up the fat. The decanted solution may be distilled without heating by the help of a vacuum pump, the essential oil, which is less volatile than the alcohol, remaining in the still. Frequently, however, the alcoholic solution is sold as a perfume under the name of "extract," and is considered perfectly satisfactory, except, perhaps, to the regularly-trained nose of the professional perfumer.

The fixed oils are used in the same way as the fats for the extraction of the essential oils, except that no heat is required to keep them liquid. The celebrated *Huiles Antiques* are merely solutions of essences in pure olive oil. They cannot be used, however, on fabrics, as handkerchiefs for example, because, after the volatile oil has evaporated, the fixed oil remains as a grease spot.

#### 5. PROCESS OF ABSORPTION.

##### (a) In the cold.

The odor of some flowers, such as the *acacia*, the *jasmine*, the *tuberose*, etc., is so delicate that even the moderate degree of heat used in the preceding process would injure, if not entirely ruin it; and under these circumstances, we must have recourse to the cold-absorption process. The original French method, rather crude indeed, but still in use to some extent, is carried out as follows: Boxes two feet wide, by three feet in length, and three inches deep, are made with wooden sides and loose, glass bottoms. On the glass is spread a thin layer of purified grease, and on the grease a layer of flowers. The boxes are then piled on one another in stacks of a convenient height, and are left undisturbed for two or three days, or until the leaves have lost all their aroma. They are then removed, and fresh ones are supplied in their stead. This operation is repeated as long as there are flowers in bloom; even if it takes all summer. If a fixed oil is to be used for the extraction, then the bottoms of the boxes are made of linen instead of glass, upon which are laid coarse cloths saturated with the oil. At the end of the season these are subjected to strong pressure, and the resulting "extract" is bottled for use. Some firms keep three or four thousand of these boxes in operation during the entire flower season.

It will be readily perceived that this process is exceedingly slow and tedious, and that a good deal of the fat or oil must adhere to the exhausted leaves and be lost, or be recovered only at the cost of considerable time and labor. Besides, it seems that the fat which has been in direct contact with the leaves, is liable to become easily rancid. Hence, other methods have been tried, one of the best of which (possibly it is the very best), we shall attempt to describe.

A box, say two feet square and six feet high, is built in such a way that two of its opposite sides can be opened and closed as doors, and when

closed they are perfectly air-tight. The other two sides, together with the top and bottom, form a fixed frame-work. From each of the fixed sides shelves, occupying the full space from door to door, but about an inch short in the other direction, project alternately, one from the right, the next from the left side of the box, and so on through the whole height. The space between the shelves should be as small as possible, consistently with convenience of manipulation. On one of the shelves are laid plates of glass, covered with a thin layer of grease. A tube projects through one side of the box, above the top shelf, and another, in like manner, below the bottom shelf. It is evident, from the construction described, that any gas or vapor which is forced through one of these tubes can only find exit through the other, and that to do so it must pass over the surface of the grease on every pane of glass in the whole box. This box is named the "Collector."

The next part of the apparatus, the "Extractor," consists of a cylinder of sheet-iron with a tight-fitting lid, about two feet in diameter and four feet high. A tube is inserted in one side near the top, and one in the opposite side near the bottom; the top one is connected with one of the tubes of the collector.

The extractor is loosely filled with flowers, and a slow current of air is driven up through them by suitable mechanism, and thence onward through the collector. The air takes up the volatile oil from the flowers and carries it over the surface of the fat, by which it is absorbed and retained. Unfortunately the oxygen of the air oxidizes a part of the essential oil and renders that part odorless, and as the air is constantly renewed the loss is continuous; besides which, the oxygen is liable to make the fat rancid. A better plan, therefore, has been suggested, and that is, to use some inert gas, such as carbonic dioxide, which can be easily and cheaply prepared, which injures neither the perfume nor the fat, and which can, after it has performed its work, be collected and used over and over again. It is, therefore, merely a "carrier," and, just like an expressman, never breaks the baggage. We think that a slight improvement might be introduced into this process. Instead of throwing the flowers directly into the extractor and being obliged to fish them out again after they have been exhausted, we would suggest that a number of shallow, circular, wire-baskets be made of such a size as to slide easily into the cylinder of the extractor, and about three inches deep. Each basket should have a hole through the centre of its bottom, and around the hole a boss or collar, whose height is equal to the depth of the basket. An iron rod of the same length as the cylinder, and carrying a large nut on its lower end, will serve as an axis on which to string the baskets. These are placed on the axis and filled as they are put in position, one by one, the collars hindering the weight of one basket from compressing the flowers in the one below it. When the pile is complete it may be lifted by the rod directly into the extractor, and when the leaves have been exhausted it can be lifted out and replaced by another, which has been prepared in the meantime and is pensively waiting its turn. By this means one man, or a manly boy,

could keep the machine a-going without loss of time, and, besides, the flowers would be more loosely and more evenly distributed, and thus be better hindered from clogging.

The grease when thoroughly impregnated with the volatile oil may be used as pomade, or as the starting-point for the preparation of extracts or of the pure oils.

(*b*) With the aid of hot air.

"Time is money," says the adage, and therefore whatever saves time in a manufacturing operation is capable of saving money. Now this last process is intended especially for rapid work.

Take an open, iron vessel—call it a pot—and as such set it up properly in a brick furnace. In the pot lay a coil of several turns of metal pipe, both ends of which are to project above and beyond the brim. Fill the pot nearly full with water, and keep it a-boiling. By means of a small pump cause a current of air or, better, carbonic dioxide, to pass through the coil, and regulate the velocity of the current so that it shall pass out at a temperature of about 150° F. If this air or gas were to be sent directly through the flowers it would soon dry them up, a proceeding to which they would so strongly object that, instead of giving up their oils readily, they would hold to them all the faster. Some authorities, therefore, instruct us to pass this hot current into a "Moistener," which is merely a sheet-iron box containing large sponges that are kept constantly wet. This looks like a clumsy contrivance. The sponges are a totally unnecessary nuisance, and will overdo their work by gathering slime and rot. Instead of using sponges partly fill the moistener, which need not be very large, with water. On the outside attach a gauge, such as is used to show the level of the water in a steam boiler, and have a supply of water connected with the moistener, so that the loss from evaporation may be supplied by simply opening a stop-cock. Then run the hot current down under the water, and in bubbling up through, it will heat the water up to its own temperature, and will, at the same time, take up all the moisture it needs to keep the flowers from drying. For greater control over the temperature a good thermometer should be installed in the head of the moistener. If the temperature rises too high urge the air-blast a little; if it falls too low slacken it some. The warm, moist air is next passed into the extractor, where it comes in contact with the leaves, and soon robs them of their volatile oils. These are thence carried forward and absorbed by some suitable solvent, from which they are obtained pure by methods already described. The great advantage of the use of hot air or gas is that it greatly reduces the time necessary for the work, so much so that instead of days, or perhaps even weeks, a few hours will suffice to obtain the oils in a perfectly pure condition. We think that enough has been said to give a fairly-good, general idea of the methods employed for the extraction of the essential oils.

#### ANIMAL PERFUMES.

Before speaking of the vegetable oils in detail we shall redeem our promise of saying a few words about certain animal substances that in-

sist on making themselves heard. All animals emit peculiar odors, and if our sense of smell were keen enough we would probably be able to distinguish by it alone their different species. The animals themselves, whose scent is much keener than man's, do certainly, by this means, recognize their friends as well as their enemies, even at great distances. These odors are most probably due to essential oils, either accompanying the fixed fats or secreted by glands in the skin. Even man is not exempt from characteristic odors, for, although we accuse the poor negro of high perfumes, he returns the compliment by solemnly assuring us that he hardly perceives those of his own race, but that the odor of the white man is quite disagreeable to him. The dog not only distinguishes between men and other animals, but will track his master among thousands of other men by the infinitesimal odor passing through the sole of a shoe and left behind at each footprint; and the still more wonderful powers of the bloodhound are well known to everybody. These odors have never, as far as we are aware, been isolated or experimented with chemically, and have no direct commercial importance. It is different, however, with the animal substances referred to above. These are *ambergris*, *castoreum*, *civet*, and *musk*.

*Ambergris* is formed in the intestines of the sperm whale, and is believed to be a diseased product. It has been taken therefrom, but is usually found floating in the sea, on the coasts of Arabia, Japan, Madagascar, and a few other places. It is of a grayish-white color, with dark streaks, of a fatty appearance and waxy consistence. It generally occurs in small pieces, but specimens have occasionally been found, weighing from 50 to 200 pounds. It is lighter than water, is softened by the heat of the hand, melts at 140 degrees Fahrenheit, and volatilizes at higher temperatures, almost completely. Strong alcohol, ether, fixed and volatile oils, all dissolve it readily. The undiluted odor is rather too strong to be pleasant to most people, but when put up in dilute preparations it is very much esteemed. The odor is so persistent that a handkerchief scented with *ambergris* will not lose it all even when washed. It is very extensively used in the manufacture of perfumes, and was formerly employed to some extent in medicine, but the modern verdict is that, as a medicine, it is practically useless. It is somewhat expensive, having sometimes been sold as high as \$10 an ounce.

*Civet* is an odorous substance obtained from the civet cat, an animal ranking between the weasel and the fox, and inhabiting China, Africa, and the East and West Indies. The animals are rather shy, and so to make sure of the supply, they are kept in confinement. Civet is semiliquid, unctuous, yellowish when fresh, but becomes brown and thick when exposed to the air. It is a mixture of certain fixed oils with resins, organic salts, and the volatile oil to which it owes its strong odor. It is now used only as a perfume, though in olden times wonderful medicinal properties were ascribed to some of its preparations.

*Castoreum* (or *castor*).—The full Latin name of the *beaver* is *castor fiber*, whence the name of the odoriferous substance produced by him. It is an oily, viscid, heavily-scented substance, secreted by special glands.

After the death of the animal the glands are removed, and dried either by smoke or in the sun, and are then ready for the market. Two tons is a fair estimate of the annual product. The beaver of the northern and northwestern parts of America is probably of a distinct species from the Russian beaver. Both however, furnish *castor*, though the Russian is said to be by far the best. To be considered good a specimen of *castor* must have a strong, even foetid odor, and a bitter, nauseous taste. It is composed of resinous matters, albumen, mucus, salts of potassium, sodium, calcium, etc., and the essential oil which scents the whole mess. It has been used more or less ever since the days of Pliny (who treats of it), in medicine, especially in nervous diseases, hysteria and the like, but it is not used as a perfume.

*Musk*.—The *musk deer* is about three feet long and two feet in height, but he has no horns. His home is in the mountains, and on the high table-lands of Asia, from India to Siberia, and from the country of the Turcomans to China. The musk is contained in an oval, projecting sac, from two to three inches long, and one to two inches broad. In the full-grown animal the sac contains, on an average, about one ounce of musk, but sometimes as much as two ounces are found, though young animals yield only half an ounce. As soon as the animal is killed, the sac is secured and dried, and without further preparation, is sent into the market. Musk varies in quality with the country inhabited by the animal and the kind of food it can procure. The best is that procured in China, but the Celestials are such adepts at sophistication that it is very doubtful if any of it ever leaves the country unadulterated. A second adulteration takes place when it reaches Europe, and, not of course for the sake of filthy gain, but merely to keep up our reputation of being even with the rest of the world, we add our share to the dishonesty.

The natural product, even when not adulterated, is found to contain a host of salts of potassium, sodium, ammonium, calcium, magnesium, iron, etc., together with fixed fats, gelatine, albumen, fibrin, resin, hair, sand, etc., and finally the unknown volatile oil on which alone the value of the substance depends. The odor is strong and penetrating, and so diffusive that one ounce of musk will communicate its scent to 250 pounds of an inodorous powder, and a single grain of it will scent a room for years without losing any appreciable part of its weight.

As a medicine, taken internally, it stimulates the exhausted nerve-centers without producing any unfavorable symptoms in other directions. It has saved many a life, but it requires all the skill of the trained physician to know just when it should be administered. Its use at the hands of grand-dames and quacks is highly to be reprehended. In the the manufacture of complex perfumes, it is used more perhaps than any other substance. The annual product is over 1000 pounds, and it is worth from \$50 to \$125 a pound according to the quality.

Owing to the rather high price of the true musk, the product of the American *musk rat*, and that of his cousin of India, has been used to some extent as a substitute. As far as the odor is concerned, it is hard

to find a difference, and after all, the odor is the main thing. Musk, or something closely resembling it, is secreted by a special gland in the jaw of the crocodile and of the alligator, but dental operations on these animals are not regarded as conducive to longevity.

In the *musk ox*, otherwise called *musk buffalo*, and, more appropriately still, *musk sheep*, the odorous substance pervades the whole body, rendering the flesh almost unfit for food. Of course, it cannot be collected. The *cerambix moschata* and some other insects emit, when crushed, an odor of musk, and the same is true of certain plants. Some other animals have reservoirs of odors which are not generally esteemed perfumes, but . . . something else. If it would not be thought impolite, we might mention the *badger*, the *polecat*, the *skunk*, and the festive, playful *bed-bug*; but it is time to pass on.

#### A FEW OF THE ESSENTIAL OILS AND THEIR PROPERTIES.

There are hundreds of essential oils, but we have space to mention only a very few even of the more important ones.

*Acacia oil*, commonly called *oil of cassie*, is obtained from the flowers of the *acacia farnesiana*, one of the four hundred and twenty species of the gum arabic genus. The oil, which has an extremely agreeable odor, is prepared either by expression or absorption. It is somewhat viscid, and of a greenish-yellow color. The manufacturers do not allow it to come into the market, but reserve it solely for the production of perfumes.

*Almond oil (bitter)* is prepared from the oil-cake left over from the manufacture of the fat oil of bitter almonds. It does not exist in the almond itself, but, together with prussic acid, is developed on the addition of water to the amygdalin of the nut. In distilling the mass, both the oil and the acid are evaporated, and then condensed in the receiver. By special chemical treatment the prussic acid, which is the most dangerous poison known, is entirely separated from the oil. The essential oil of bitter almonds, if absolutely pure, is not considered a poison, and is even used by the perfumer and the confectioner, but the safest way to use it is to have nothing to do with it. An artificial oil has been produced which is perfectly identical with the natural product; but there is another, which is only an imitation, and which resembles the true oil only by its odor; this is the nitro-benzole of the chemist; it is a rank poison.

*Anised oil*, from the seeds of the *anise* plant, is manufactured chiefly in southern Russia. When freshly prepared it is almost colorless, but it turns dark by age and loses its agreeable odor. Its taste is decidedly sweetish, but with a burning after-taste. It is chiefly used in the manufacture of liqueurs.

*Bayberry oil* is extracted by distillation from the leaves of the bay, or bayberry tree, which grows luxuriantly in the West Indies. There are many species of this plant, with entirely different odors, and the admixture of a small quantity of the wrong kind would entirely ruin the oil. When freshly distilled the odor is rank, but in the course of from three

to six months it becomes mellow, and ripens into the agreeable fragrance so much liked in the best specimens of bay-rum.

*Bergamot oil.*—The bergamot tree belongs to the orange tribe, and, just as in the case of the orange and the lemon, the oil is extracted from the rind of the fruit by the process of expression. A hundred bergamot oranges will yield about three ounces of oil. It is of a pale-green or yellowish color, becoming dark by age. The odor is simply delicious when the oil is in good condition, though if light and air be allowed to act upon it a disagreeable smell of turpentine is developed, which entirely spoils it. Besides its use in perfumery, it has been recommended as a sure cure for scabies.

*Birch oil.*—The bark of the common European *white birch* yields an oil which is used in the dressing of Russia leather, and which imparts to that leather its peculiar odor. It is prepared by what is called "dry distillation." The bark is placed in an earthen still having a hole in the bottom, through which the oil runs into another vessel sunk into the ground. The heat is applied by burning the wood of the tree around the upper vessel.

The *American birch*, variously called *sweet birch*, *black birch*, *cherry birch*, and *mountain mahogany*, is remarkable for the aromatic flavor of its bark and leaves, and yields an essential oil by distillation. It is largely manufactured in Schuylkill county, Pa. The first step is the gathering of the tree. Small trees, not over ten feet high, are preferred. They are cut up in a chopping machine into pieces from one to four inches long, and are then transferred to the still. Water is added, and the still is left in this condition over night. The oil does not exist, at least in any appreciable quantity, in the tree itself, but, as in the case of the almond, is formed by the reactions which take place between the water and the inodorous principles of the wood, bark, and leaves. The next day the liquid is distilled off, and the water separated from the oil by gravity. The oil is then rectified in the usual manner. Five pounds of oil from a ton of tree is considered a fair yield. This oil is very nearly related to the oil of wintergreen, for which it is largely substituted in confectionery and perfumery.

*Chamomile oil.*—Two varieties of chamomile oil are found in commerce, one *green* and the other *blue*. Blue chamomile is the one chiefly used in the manufacture of liquors and perfumery and in medicine. It is obtained by distillation from the flowers of the common chamomile plant. The pure oil has a beautiful blue color, and on heating gives off blue vapors. It has a penetrating odor, which does not resemble the odor of the flowers until it has been strongly diluted. By exposure to air and light it turns green, then brown, and finally is converted into a thickly-fluid brownish mass. It is frequently adulterated with oil of lemons.

*Green Chamomile oil* is derived from the Roman chamomile plant, which, pretending to be the only genuine article, looks down on the common kind with contempt. It possesses the pleasant odor of fresh lemons, but is used only in medicine.



*Camphor and camphor oil.*—There are many varieties of camphor, differing considerably in their physical properties, but they all agree in being colorless, crystalline substances, completely volatile and combustible, and in diffusing strong aromatic odors. The two kinds best known in commerce, are the Chinese, called also Japanese or laurel camphor, and the Borneo camphor. They are strictly distinct products. Laurel camphor is derived from a tree of the same name indigenous to the island of Formosa, on the coast of China. Every part of the tree contains camphor, and it is frequently found in crystalline masses between the bark and the wood, and in the pith. It is extracted by boiling the chopped wood in water. It rises to the surface and becomes solid, as the water cools. It is generally refined in Europe by sublimation, which differs from distillation only in this, that the condensed product is solid instead of liquid. This is the camphor so well known in this country and in Europe.

*Borneo camphor* is the product of a tree belonging to the Island of Borneo. It is highly prized as a medicine by the people of eastern Asia, and hence is much dearer than the other variety. Hence, also, it is rarely found in European or American commerce. The Chinese and Japanese are equally fond of the odor of camphor, and manage to get it into almost everything they use or export. On account of its reputed antiseptic qualities it is largely used by both Europeans and Americans in the manufacture of dentifrices, soaps, aromatic vinegars, etc. As to its medicinal properties, all that can be said is that "doctors disagree," and disagree diametrically on nearly every point concerning it. We can afford to let them have it out in their own way.

*Camphor oil* is likewise of two sorts, corresponding to the two camphors. The Japanese oil is obtained by distillation from the branches of the laurel camphor tree, the liquid distilled over being surrounded by cold water. The camphor itself separates out to a certain extent as a semi-solid mass, but to free it from the oil or the oil from it recourse is had to heavy pressure. The oil so obtained is called crude oil, by the re-distillation of which a "*light oil*" is collected in the receiver. This light oil has been used in the place of turpentine for the manufacture of varnishes, for which purpose it is equally as good, and it has the further advantage that it will dissolve copal and some other resins, which turpentine will not, and, lastly, it is less injurious to the health of the workmen, and it can be sold wholesale for twenty-five cents a gallon.

The *Borneo camphor oil* is procured in a different way. Incisions are made in the young trees, from which the oil flows as a thickly-fluid mass having an odor of turpentine. This is distilled to free it from a small quantity of resin which it contains, but it differs from the Japanese oil in not containing any dissolved camphor.

*Caraway oil* is obtained from the seeds of the caraway, so well known in this country. It is almost colorless, of a very aromatic odor and acrid taste, becoming brownish-yellow by age, and then showing an acid reaction. It is used in pharmacy as an addition to purgative medi-

cines to prevent griping, also as a scent for cheap toilet soaps and in the manufacture of liqueurs.

*Cedar oil* is not derived from the true cedar of Lebanon, but from a species of juniper commonly called *Virginia cedar*. It is obtained by distillation from the shavings of the wood falling off in the manufacture of lead pencils. The oil contains another oil, semi-solid, in solution, from which it is separated by a second distillation. It is a colorless, mobile fluid, but absorbs oxygen and thickens on exposure to the air. On account of its agreeable odor it is frequently used in perfumery.

*Cinnamon Oils*.—(a) The *genuine* oil is obtained from the *bark* of the Ceylon cinnamon tree, which grows to a height of twenty or thirty feet. The bark is steeped for several days in water and then distilled. The oil is of a pale-yellow or, when old, of a reddish-brown color and of an agreeable odor and biting but pure sweet taste.

(b) The oil from the *flowers* of the same plant closely resembles the genuine oil, but the chemist manages to find enough difference to allow him to draw a distinction.

(c) An oil is obtained from the *leaves* of the same tree entirely different from the genuine oil. It resembles the oil of cloves in taste and odor as well as in other properties.

(d) The *China cinnamon* or *Cassia* is inferior to the Ceylon, and so is the oil yielded by it. It is, however, frequently used as a substitute both in Europe and this country. The oil is extensively employed to adulterate the genuine product.

*Clove Oil*.—Every part of the clove-tree abounds in aromatic, essential oil, but it is most plentiful and fragrant in the unexpanded buds of the flower, and these are the cloves of commerce. To obtain the oil the buds are soaked for some time in salt water, and then submitted to distillation. The buds yield about 16 per cent. of their weight in oil. It is colorless when fresh, and has the taste and odor of the cloves to perfection.

*Coriander Oil*.—The coriander plant is much cultivated in Italy, where it seems to have originated. It is a singular fact that all parts of the fresh plant are highly fœtid when bruised, while the fruit becomes fragrant by drying. The oil is obtained by distillation as usual. It is used in the preparation of liqueurs and perfumery soaps, and to cover the taste of unpleasant medicines.

*Eucalyptus Oil*.—There are at least 140 known species of eucalyptus tree, all natives of Australia, though in their own homes they are called by the more plebeian names of "gum-trees" and "string-bark trees." They constitute four-fifths of the vegetation of Australia, and are especially noted for their fever-destroying qualities. In the *Eucalyptus amygdalina* the yield of oil is very abundant, 100 pounds of leaves furnishing about 6 pounds of oil. The oil varies in color according to the species of tree, from light-yellow to pale-blue, but becomes thicker and darker by age. It has an odor resembling that of camphor, and an acrid, pungent taste. Twelve different oils, from as many different trees, are found in commerce, but they do not appear to possess the febrifuge properties of the growing tree.

*Garlic oil* is derived from the bulb of the garlic plant, and is especially interesting as containing sulphur. The oil does not pre-exist in the bulb, but is formed in a similar manner as bitter almond oil by a chemical process. The most simple mode of preparation is by submitting the bulbs to distillation with water. The crude oil is of a dark, brownish-yellow color, has an exceedingly pungent, garlic-like odor, and a strong, acrid taste, and when applied to the skin produces much irritation and sometimes even blisters. It is rectified by repeated distillations over a salt-water bath. The oil of garlic, taken internally in moderate doses, acts as a stimulant and as a promoter of digestion. In overdoses it is liable to occasion irritation, flatulence, hæmorrhoids, headache, and fever. Onions and leeks possess the same virtues but in a milder form.

*Hop oil*, though not used in perfumery, is of great importance, it being much used in breweries, especially in those working with malt extract, to give beer its characteristic aroma and also to make it *keep*. It is obtained by distillation from the flowers of the common hop. It has a pale yellow color, an acrid taste, and a strong odor of hops, and has, in a higher degree than any other essential oil, the property of checking fermentation.

*Jasmine (or jessamine) oil* is from the flowers of the well known jessamine plant. It is obtained by the absorption process, and is the most highly prized of all the essences. It is very scarce and proportionately dear, a fluid ounce having been sold for \$45. It has one good point however, as an offset, and that is that it cannot be imitated, nor adulterated without immediate detection.

*Juniper oil* is contained in all the parts, but especially in the berries, of the common juniper. It is thinly fluid, with a sweetish, turpentine-like odor and taste. It is used in medicine as a diuretic, and in preparing gin, which owes its characteristic aroma to this oil. Possibly a little too much gin is used for the same purpose, or for other purposes.

*Lavender oil*.—The two varieties of the lavender tree are the narrow-leaved and the broad-leaved ones. The best oil is obtained by distilling the flowers of the narrow-leaved variety, and a somewhat inferior product, by using at the same time, the stems. An acre of ground under cultivation will yield from 10 to 12 pounds of oil, which is obtained from about one ton of flowers. It is employed for the manufacture of the finest perfumes and soaps, and for costly extracts.

The broad-leaved variety grows wild and the oil, called oil of "Spike," is inferior to the true lavender oil and is much used as an adulterant.

*Lemon oil* is prepared by the expression process, as already described; or the rinds may be soaked in salt water and then subjected to distillation. About an ounce of oil may be had from ten good lemons. The odor of the oil is similar to that of the fresh fruit. It is used as a stimulant in medicine, and as a flavoring substance in the culinary departments of well regulated households.

*Mustard oil* is prepared from the seeds of the black mustard, after the fixed oil has been expressed. The oil-cake is macerated with water,

just as it is in the case of the bitter almond, and for the same reason. The pure volatile oil is transparent, and possesses in the highest degree the sharp, pungent odor of mustard. It blisters the skin, and its vapor excites tears and produces, even in small quantity, inflammation of the eyes. Diluted with sixty times its bulk of water it may, by means of a piece of cloth, be applied as a substitute for mustard-plaster, with the advantage of not making a mess.

*Orange oil* is obtained in the same way as the oil of lemon. In commerce it is called *oil*, or *essence of Portugal*. It is of a beautiful golden color and has a refreshing odor. It is extensively used in the manufacture of liqueurs and perfumery.

*Orange-flower oil*, called also *oil of neroli*, is obtained either by distillation or maceration, from the flowers of the orange, or of some of its kindred. These oils are entirely colorless when fresh, and have a peculiar burning taste, the odor, however, being delicious. They are seldom if ever, found pure in commerce.

*Pennyroyal oil* is distilled from the entire plant. It is pale-yellow, and has an odor of its own, which is said to be effective in driving away the musical mosquito, but we have seen that interesting animal almost taking a bath in the oil, with evident delight. It is of use in case of sick stomach, and to correct the griping effects of the more violent purgatives.

*Peppermint oil* is one of the few volatile oils produced on a large scale. In the United States, where the greater portion of the oil is made, there are cultivated and distilled on the average, about 15,000 tons of peppermint plants, yielding about 100,000 pounds of oil. New York, Michigan, and Ohio, are the principal places of production. In cultivation the roots are set two feet apart, and the ground is kept well hoed and clear of weeds, a very few of which in the still would impair the naturally fresh, penetrating and delicious taste of peppermint. The plants which have been exhausted are dried and used as fodder. They are preferred by cattle to any other kind of food, though they will not touch the green herb. This fact is taken advantage of by turning sheep into a field of mint in order that they may clear it of grass. The oil is sold for three or four dollars a pound, though the market is liable to be very unsteady. It is nearly colorless, or at most of a very pale-greenish color. It is employed in flavoring confectionery, perfumes, essences, and peppermint cordials. As a household medicine the world over it holds the first rank, especially for children's complaints.

*Rose oil*.—This oil, which is frequently called *Attar*, or *Oil of Roses*, is manufactured on a small scale in France and in England. Persia and India supply a certain quantity, but it is only in Bulgaria that it is produced on a really large scale. The flowers are distilled at a pretty high temperature, but the yield is very small. The estimates differ, though it is certain that in the most favorable conditions, it requires more than 3000 pounds of flowers to produce one pound of oil. We all know the odor of roses and the uses to which the oil may be applied. The annual product is said to be about 3000 pounds from Bulgaria alone, and this is

valued at nearly \$15,000,000. What the rest of the word produces probably no one can tell.

*Turpentine oil* is also called *spirits of turpentine*, and *essence of turpentine*. It is obtained from the different species of the pine tree. In this country the principal source is the common yellow, or Georgia pine. Notwithstanding the name, it is found in other states besides Georgia, as North and South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The turpentine is extracted as follows: During the fall and winter the trees are "boxed;" this means that large holes capable of holding about a gallon are made in the trees a few inches above the roots. These holes slant inwards and downwards, so as to retain the "crude" or sap, which flows into them. The "crude" is transferred to stills which hold from 12 to 20 barrels each. A barrel weighs 220 pounds, and yields about 20 per cent. of its weight of "spirits" and 60 per cent. of its weight of "rosin." The details of the manufacture would be too long to recount here, especially as we have already far exceeded the space allotted to us. Besides some slight use in medicine, turpentine is indispensable in several of the arts, and above all in the manufacture of paints and varnishes; and the consumption is enormous.

*Wormwood oil* is used in the manufacture of *absinthe*, and is of some interest to those who like that kind of thing; but it will never hurt the man who steers clear of it.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

---

## Book Notices.

---

A STORY OF COURAGE. Annals of the Georgetown Convent of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. From the manuscript records. By *George Parsons Lathrop* and *Rose Hawthorne Lathrop*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1894.

When two brave souls tell a story of courage, the incidents they relate must be much more vividly, because sympathetically described, than if the same tale were told by persons whose moral valor has never been put to the test. While it is no doubt true that every convert to the Church is made to face a certain amount of open, or covert sneering, for what the world regards as a mark of mental weakness, in the case of a person of prominence the sneerings, or other more substantial indications of hatred for Catholicism, are greatly increased, and therefore he, and especially she, who faces all this calmly and confesses openly submission to Rome, is clearly entitled to be called courageous.

Hence, it is peculiarly fitting that the authors of the work before us were chosen to tell of the trials and difficulties which confronted the pious and brave souls to whom is due the praise and honor of making what it is the Convent of the Visitation, at Georgetown.

From the first clause in the preface to the volume, to the last clause of the last chapter, the one prominent characteristic of the work is sympathetic, and highly intelligent, interest in the religious life. Even Montalembert himself, displays no more loving appreciation of the monastic life than do Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop.

The arrangement of the volume is excellent. The first chapter, "On the Threshold," and the second, "Introduction to the Convent," reverently introduce the reader to the very place, whose history is afterwards told, with charming simplicity and directness. One feels that not only have the authors of the volume obtained the unusual privilege of being admitted into the sacred precincts, but that they have managed to introduce with them, albeit invisibly, whoever reads their story. And just here it should be remarked that Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop are entirely just in concluding the preface with the words, "This volume is not a mere piece of editing, or a compilation, but is an original work, though following closely and accurately the authentic records from which it is derived."

To the Catholic reader, many of the details showing the contentment, as well as the obedience, of the members of the community, may seem very like proving that the sun gives light and heat; but to the non-Catholic of fair mind, the details can not fail to bring light into what he is apt to regard as a dark place. Bearing in mind that Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop know, from their own past experience, how widespread is the ignorant prejudice against the conventual system existing among non-Catholics, one feels that in telling the history of the Visitation Convent, the authors have an intense desire to make known to their former associates in religion how much the whole world owes to the unselfish and brave lives of the religious.

Owing to the limited space at the command of the reviewer, it is quite impossible to give even a brief sketch of the Order of the Visitation and its establishment in the United States. And it is well that it is so, for the

story is told so smoothly and so charmingly that it would only suffer from any attempt at abridgment.

While throughout the volume there prevails the gravity of style befitting the subject, the authors here and there introduce little incidents, for instance, that of the clock, p. 48 *et seq.*, which cause a smile. The volume has a number of excellent illustrations, the most interesting, perhaps, being the fac-simile of the original circular of the academy, at p. 138.

The completeness of the work done for the good sisters by Mr. and Mrs. Lathrop is shown by the titles of the chapters. Following the two preliminary chapters, noticed above, which serve not only to introduce the reader into the convent, but to acquaint him with the daily routine of life in the community, there is Chapter III., "The Visitation Established in the United States." The treatment of this chapter is particularly felicitous and artistic, for it opens with a prediction of Saint Francis de Sales, which was made in 1619 and which found its fulfilment in 1798, and closes with a vision granted to Father Leonard Neale, to whom the community in Georgetown owes so much.

Next comes Chapter IV., which contains a very graphic account of the foundation of the Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary by Saint Francis de Sales and Saint Jane de Chantal. And the story of the foundation, like that of the establishment in Georgetown, was indeed a story of courage.

Chapter V. is entitled a "Life Sketch of Saint Francis de Sales," and Chapter VI. a "Life Sketch of Saint Jane de Chantal." Here again the wise and orderly use of their material, by the authors, is shown, and there is shown, too, the advantage of having the work done by a man and a woman inspired by the same ideals, and filled with the same faith. Each of these well-named life sketches is made vivid by incidents in the career of its subject, and they glow with that fire of charity kindled only in the heart of God's saints. And not alone is charity found here, but that supernatural faith which could prompt Saint Francis to write to Saint Jane, who was beset by so many difficulties, "We should be as willing to fail as to succeed (if it be God's will)." And that other profound thought, "God makes people co-operate with Him when they are least aware of it." On one occasion, Saint Jane, who was in the City of Bruges, of which her brother was Archbishop, was extremely anxious to go to Saint Francis, in Paris, and her brother, to whom she had applied for a carriage, fearing to let her go, refused. Nothing daunted, this brave daughter of her whose visitation was her inspiration, answered the refusal with "Monsignor, obedience has good legs." The carriage was not long delayed.

But enough of these evidences of earnest devotion to work and unfaltering confidence in God might be culled from this garden of holy souls to outrun the limits of what is only meant to call attention to the work before us, and therefore we must pass on.

The next Chapter, VII., contains the "Annals of the Georgetown Convent." To any one that has ever had the happiness to be a pupil in the convent, this chapter will be full of delight; to any one that appreciates courage in the day of danger, and sweet self control in the day of adversity, it will be a source of strength and cheerfulness in his, or her, own times of trial.

To the Catholic man or woman, whose heart is warm with love for that Blessed Mother whose arms have encircled them ever since their infancy, the story of her gracious and constant care for this community, knit together in the bonds of her boundless love, will be very helpful in

keeping warm their love for her. But it will have another and special interest to the convert, to the man or woman whose early and, perchance, mature years, have passed over without a thought of her, who, in their case, has indeed proved herself to be the confounder of heresies, and who, much more than that, has proved herself to be the most tender of mothers, ever ready to heal the wounds gained in the battle of life, and it may be most tender to those who have come late to her embrace.

To the convert, this story of courage done in her honor, will afford the happiness that comes from knowing that here, in this community, is daily offered, in her service, such an abundance of loving deeds as, in a measure, to make up for the years spent by him or her in ignorance, or possibly, ignoble thoughts of her.

In conclusion, the volume, as a specimen of the bookmaker's art, is exceedingly attractive; and, irrespective of its intrinsic value, which has been very inadequately touched upon, it will be a distinct addition to any book-shelf. Especially should it be found in every Catholic library, whether public or private.

W. R. C.

---

AN EXPOSITION OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, consisting of an analysis of each chapter, and of a commentary, critical, exegetical, doctrinal and moral. By the Most Rev. Dr. MacEvilly, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Bensiger Brothers. 1895. 8vo., pp. 278.

This is the sixth volume of commentaries on the books of the New Testament from the pen of Doctor MacEvilly. He began, sometime prior to 1876, with two volumes on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles; then followed one volume on the Gospel of Sts. Matthew and Mark, one on the Gospel of St. Luke, and one on the Gospel of St. John. The volume now before us on the Acts of the Apostles completes the New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse.

We are glad to be able to repeat in regard to this book what a reviewer in the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, for October, 1876, said about Doctor MacEvilly's commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark:

... "It is unquestionably a valuable accession to English Catholic biblical literature. Archbishop MacEvilly, following the sensible practice of most Catholic commentators, concerns himself more with the kernel than the shell that encloses it; in other words, busies himself more with investigating the true meaning of the text, than with a display of verbal criticism and that far-fetched erudition which is so profusely paraded in the commentaries of heterodox and rationalist interpreters. This pompous show is simply meant to hide their emptiness and want of substance in what is most essential. Our author has quite enough of erudition and critical exegesis to satisfy not only the ordinary reader, but even the biblical student. What, however, he has principally in view is the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Sacred Books, in drawing out which he is full and at times perhaps even diffuse."

This book begins with an introduction in which the author treats briefly of the title of the Acts of the Apostles, of their author, of the time when they were written, of the place where they were written, of their language, of their canonicity and of their inspiration. In the body of the work, the Sacred Text of a chapter is given first, then follows a short analysis of the chapter, and then comes the commentary, which occupies the body of the page, while the text of each verse is printed in the margin. The work ends with an index.

The introduction is generally satisfactory, except that it omits altogether a chronological table. We think the reason given by the author for this omission is not a good one. He says that the great difference of opinion



in regard to the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles has deterred him from touching on this question. For the same reason he should abstain from trying to explain very many passages in the text about which critics differ. Commentators like Cornelius a Lapide give to us the chronology of the Acts, and they may safely be followed in this as in other parts of their works.

In the body of the work, the question of authorities is far from satisfactory. There is no list of authors or books quoted, but the surname of an author is frequently given, with not even a foot-note to tell who the man was, when he lived, what he wrote, or what value is to be attached to his opinion. For example, we frequently find Beelen quoted without a word to indicate that the author refers to John Theodore Beelen, who was professor of scripture and oriental language in the University of Louvaine, and whose exhaustive work on the literal sense of the scriptures was published in 1845. Patrizzi is also quoted without the explanation that he was a recent writer on the same subject. Again, Bloomfield is quoted without a word of caution that he was an English Protestant clergyman—Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D., who, in 1832, published a Greek Testament in two vols., which contains many incorrect views of the meaning of the text. We might note other instances, but these will suffice to show that the system of quotations may be improved in future editions.

The index is a pretence. It is without exception the poorest work of its kind that we have ever seen. It contains altogether 137 entries, and no attempt has been made to sub-index, or rather the attempt has been so badly made, that its absence would have been preferable. For instance, "Adrumetum" follows "apostles," and "Agrippa" follows "Apollo." The entries are made in the most careless manner. We find the words "earthquake" and "Lydia" the only entries in connection with the visit of St. Paul to "Philippi." Even the name of the place is omitted. This is true of many other important places. "Lystra" is not mentioned. The entries bearing upon the stirring events that transpired at that place are really laughable. We have, first, "Apostles Barnabas and Paul," although in the Sacred Book Paul is always mentioned first after his visit to Cypress in the beginning of his missionary career. The next entry, referring to what took place at Lystra, is "Barnabas taken for Jupiter in Lycaonia." Not a word to indicate that St. Paul was taken for Mercury in the same place. Then follows this entry: "Rain, gift of God," which was a statement made by St. Paul at Lystra in one of his sermons. Not a word about the healing of the cripple, which led the heathen priests to mistake Paul and Barnabas for Mercury and Jupiter; not a word about the attempted sacrifice; not a word about the stoning of St. Paul. Under the heading, "St. Paul," we find this sub-entry: "Maltreatment of, p. 115." Now there is not a word in the whole chapter about St. Paul.

We have dwelt on this matter at some length, because this mean index is a blot on the book to which it is attached, and because such blots bring otherwise good books into bad repute. We are sorry to find one more fault before closing this notice. There is only one map in the book and it is marked, "The Apostle's Journeys." Many persons will know that the journeys of St. Paul are meant, but as this book is meant for the general reader, the statement should be made more clearly. On this map four journeys are marked with different colored lines, but not a word of explanation is given as to which journey was first, which second, which third and which fourth. Any one who has ever tried to trace the travels of St. Paul, even on a good map, will appreciate the difficulties

that await the student who shall try to follow the apostle of the Gentiles over this one.

We wish that the book were a translation of Cornelius a Lapide. It is a pity that Catholics have not undertaken the translation of that great master, and that such a work has been left to unfriendly hands. The writer of this notice once asked the late Monsignor Corcoran his opinion of a Lapide, and of the Oxford translation of his commentary on the Gospels. He said that a Lapide was the best of all commentators, and that the Oxford translation should be read by Catholics with caution.

We remember seeing an announcement in some foreign correspondence about a year ago, that the Jesuits had begun, some place in Europe, a complete translation of this great work, but we have not been able to verify it. J. P. T.

---

GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES. Von *Johannes Jannsen*. Culturzustände des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zum Beginn des dreissigjährigen Krieges. Viertes Buch, Ergänzt und herausgegeben von Ludwig Pastor. Band viii. Auflage 1-12. Freiburg und St. Louis, Mo. Herder. Pp. LV. 719. Pr., \$2.50.

None of the preceding portions of Jannsen's great work bears out more strikingly its claim to be a history of the German *people* than does this, its most recent volume. In the seventh volume the historian carried his readers back to the school and university life of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and pointed out the forces that wrought the intellectual status of the time. In the present volume he places us in the midst of the economical, social, moral religious life, and we see the forces at play that made for the lowest as well as for the highest conditions of German activity at the beginning and during the earlier stages of the great Revolution. We enter first into the busy scenes of commerce; follow the outgoings of trade into the surrounding states; the development of the Hanseatic League and the influence of the religious secession on that organization; the tariff system throughout the empire; the increase of bankruptcy; the spread of usurious monetary exactions, practised especially by the Jews; the hopeless confusion and deterioration of coinage; the consequent collapse, particularly of the mining industry. From the marts of commerce we enter the shop of the workingman and learn the state of the trades unions, the guilds, the tyranny of the masters, the sad condition of the journeyman and apprentice in those troubled times. From the surroundings of the artisan we are led to the farm, to the cot of the peasant, to view the wretchedness of the poor under the grinding oppression of the nobility. What a wail goes up to heaven from the downtrodden peasantry. "Could the Egyptian servitude have been greater or heavier than that which is yoked to the poor man of to-day," writes Nigrinus Hessian, superintendent in 1574. "What sighs rend the clouds! The prophet Isaias in his castigation of the lords of power aptly describes the state of our own times. But come not to Germany, my dear Isaias, and preach so strongly to the lofty and powerful, lest you go hence with bloody head, for not alone with saws, but with their very teeth would they tear you." (P. 114.)

Over against the misery of the working classes we are shown the picturing of luxury of the upper ranks of society. One turns with loathing from the scenes of revelry, debauch and all the bestiality which followed in their wake. We need not look to the new doctrine for the root and cause of the widespread corruption. They are to be found ever at work in the animal propensities of human nature; but that these propensities were given vent almost without control by the principles of the new be-

lief, is evident from the most cursory examination of their very nature, as well as by such a broad study of their practical working, as is here presented by Janssen, and especially, we might add, by his editor and continuator Pastor in his picture of the general moral-religious depravity, the material of which he has simply transferred from the confessions of the reformers themselves.

From this scene of corruption we turn to the development of witchcraft and the persecution of the witches under the new order of things. The origin of sorcery in pre-Christian times, its relation to the early German mythology, its development during the Middle Ages, its propagation during the days of so-called reform, the persecution to which sorcerers were subjected, both in Catholic and Protestant districts; all these points are developed at considerable length, the whole subject taking up about two hundred pages of the volume. And here as elsewhere throughout the work, the picture is objective. There are no exaggerations of the writer, no placing of facts in abnormal positions so as to produce effects untrue to reality. The effort throughout is plainly to set before the reader a faithful reproduction of sixteenth century life in Germany as it was, with its virtues and its vices blending as they did, and the forces, the influences that made for the one as well as for the other.

It is by this feature that Janssen has revived the Reformation days, portraying the people and their environment as they were seen and described by eye-witnesses, by those who took part in the very dramas they themselves describe and which he has simply presented to a modern public, that makes his work of such unsurpassed value for constructing a right judgment on that most momentous period of modern history. Janssen was a firm believer in the possibility of a philosophy of history. But he insisted on the philosophy coming forth from the events, not from the subjectivism, the theories and prejudices of the historian.

It is a subject for rejoicing that the work has fallen into the hands of a continuator like Dr. Pastor. Comparing the additions by the editor with the body of the original one fails to discover any difference either in minuteness of research, in breadth of erudition or in just appreciation of proportion and perspective in presentation. We trust the disciple may be given the time and strength necessary to put the crown on his master's work.

---

PRÆLECTIONES DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN COLLEGIO DITTON-HALL HABEBAT. *Christianus Pesch, S. J.* Tom. I, Institutiones Propædæuticæ ad Sacram Theologiam (I., De Christo Legato Divino. II., De Ecclesia Christi. III., De Locis Theologicis). Friburgi Brisgoviae. 1894. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. Pp. xiii. 403. Pr. \$2 00.

Father Pesch has a long standing claim on the gratitude of the learned world for his scholarly contributions to the "Stimmen aus Marien-Laach." He adds much to that claim by the present volume on Fundamental Theology, the first of a series intended to cover the entire field of dogmatic science. His scope in this volume carries him far beyond the mere compendium, yet not so far outward as the many titled "Cursus Completus." He holds to the midway, aiming to furnish a work adapted to the wants of students who follow a four years' curriculum of dogmatic theology, wherein two hours are allowed for daily lectures on the study. That his work will meet this purpose he has proven by actual use in its manuscript state in his own classes.

Besides, however, the professional student of theology in seminary and university, the priest and the layman, who has mastery of its language,

will find the work helpful in enlarging and deepening their knowledge of theology. At least this will be the case with the present initial volume, which includes, in respect of timeliness, the most important parts of dogmatics, that which is generally called apologetics or fundamental theology. And this larger adaptability of the work will be in no small degree enhanced by the features which so peculiarly fit it for use in the lecture hall—its clear-cut divisions, neat propositions, well-marked headings and copious indexes.

The volume before us starts right at the roots of its subject, with an introductory chapter on the nature and division of theology in general, followed by another chapter on dogmatic theology in particular, its systematization and historical development. Apologetics is, of course, built on philosophy, whose province it is to furnish rational demonstration of the divine existence, the duty of religious worship, the possibility of revelation, the possibility and knowableness of miracles, and the obligation of embracing a special form of religious worship, provided God has, by revelation, demanded such. On these philosophical presuppositions rises the inquiry whether God has *de facto* revealed a number of truths and a line of duty concerning man's belief and conduct. This question must be solved historically in as much as revelation is viewed as a fact, and philosophically in as much as revelation is regarded as divine. The method of inquiry may proceed synthetically. Of the various revelations existing in the course of human history, one claims especial attention by reason of its universality and marvelous influence on humanity—the religion whereof Jesus Christ is the founder, objective Christianity. Are the facts narrated of the Founder of the Christian revelation historically certain, and did He stamp His message to men with the seal of divinity? The answer to this question necessitates a critical study of the sources of our Lord's history, the genuineness of the Gospel narrative, its credibility, the testimony Christ made to His own mission, the proofs He gave thereof by miracle and prophecy, by the way He provided for the propagation of His doctrine and the internal criteria He impressed upon it. This line of inquiry marks the first stage in our author's thought—on Christ as a divine messenger to men—the *Demonstratio Christiana*.

The Founder of Christianity did not communicate His message directly to the individual man. Where then is to be found the channel between Him and individual souls? Did He of a certainty establish a teaching body and endow it with power to transmit His teaching unflinchingly to posterity, if so, what manner of society is that body, what its properties and visible marks, by what organs does it exercise its functions, what the range of certitude in its teaching? This indicates the second stage in our author's study—the Church of Christ—the *Demonstratio Catholica*.

The Church must prove and spread the message Christ entrusted to it by means of certain organs, which, in so far as they are informed by divine truths, are called the sources of theological doctrine, the *fontes* or *loci theologici*. The explaining and establishing of these sources or the value of tradition, the authority of the fathers and theologians, the existence and extent of inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures occupy the third and final part in the volume at hand.

From this hasty outline it will be seen that a considerable part of the work is occupied with subjects that are also treated in an introduction to the study of the Bible. It should, however, be noted that the point of view differs. Here the sacred writings are regarded in the light of simply historical documents, with the object of proving thence the origin,

nature, range and prerogatives of the Magisterium Ecclesiæ. In the introduction to Biblical study this teaching office may be presupposed as theologically proven.

Those who read this volume will certainly echo our wish that the succeeding portions of the series may come forth without delay.

F. P. S.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF LAGENIENSIS. Dublin: James Duffy & Co., Ltd. 1893. Pp. viii., 328.

All who have already had the privilege of reading any of the previous editions, whether in periodical or book form, of "The Land of Leix," "The Legend Lays of Ireland," "The Legend of Kilonan," or who have become acquainted with "Lageniensis" through his other productions, either in prose or verse, will be sure to welcome with renewed pleasure this collection of his poetical works.

Those who have not yet had this good fortune, especially those of Irish origin, who love to hear of the old tales and legends, and to learn more of the poetry and history, the biography and romance, of the land of their fathers, will find, we think, in these poems, and in the wealth of historical, biographical, and topographical notes, with which they are illustrated, a real fund of enjoyment and profit.

As most of the pieces in this collection, and some other works from the same pen, appeared originally under the *nom de plume* of "Lageniensis," that title is retained in this edition, though the author's identity has long been publicly known, and is avowed by himself in the dedication and elsewhere in the present volume. We are at liberty, therefore, to give his real name, and think we shall gratify many of our readers by stating a few facts of his personal history, which we have learned both from his books and from the information of his personal friends.

"Lageniensis" is another name for the well-known Irish and American patriot, the Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, "the Irish Alban Butler," as he has been justly styled, from his *magnum opus*, "Lives of the Irish Saints," of which eight large volumes, enriched with copious and erudite notes, have already appeared. A long list of his other publications will be found appended to this volume. His literary activity and industry, involving, as they do, a great deal of careful study and research, and carried on for the most part while attending to the exacting parochial duties, at first of curate and afterwards of parish priest, in a populous Dublin parish, are indeed marvellous. It is interesting to learn that a large proportion of the poems in the present volume were composed, and some of them first published, over forty years ago in this country, where the author spent about eleven years, several of them in missionary work as a priest of the diocese of St. Louis, and two or more as professor in its theological seminary. In consequence of ill-health he returned to Ireland in 1853, where a little rest and the invigorating air of his native Laoighis (pronounced Leéish-Leix, Queen's Co.), happily effected a speedy restoration. Since then he has labored in the diocese of Dublin, where he is at present a parish priest and Canon of the Cathedral Chapter, having been appointed to this latter office by Archbishop Walsh. He is a member of the Royal Irish Academy, and has been a particular friend of his fellow academicians, the great Irish scholars, O'Donovan and O'Curry. We may add that it is mainly to his efforts that the Irish capital is indebted for the superb statue of Daniel O'Connell that graces its chief thoroughfare. His zeal overcame all obstacles and kept up the enthusiasm of the friends of the movement until the project was carried to a successful completion.

Father O'Hanlon's chief title to fame will undoubtedly be his hagiological labors. The present very acceptable volume shows indeed, we think, that he might have attained very high rank as a poet had he devoted himself to poetry as he has to biography and history; but we are glad that he has apparently given to poetry only his recreation, and bestowed his most serious labor in the cultivation of his chosen field, the "Lives of the Irish Saints."

Of this great work, four volumes (September to December) remain yet to be completed. We do not know how far he has advanced in the preparation of his materials, but trust that, notwithstanding his already advanced age he will be able to command the time and labor necessary to finish the work, and sincerely hope that he may be spared to see its happy completion.

---

THE GAELIC JOURNAL. (Vol. v., Dublin, 1894.)

We have received the opening numbers of vol. v. of this "Journal," which is a monthly publication devoted to the study of the Irish language and literature. Whether the present efforts to perpetuate the use of Irish as a spoken idiom be successful or not, it is manifestly of great importance to students of all branches of the old Celtic tongue, and to philologists generally, that as many as possible of its words and phrases be recorded and their meaning ascertained and placed beyond doubt, and within the reach of scholars, while it is still possible to do so. In this work, as well as in other respects, the Journal is evidently doing good service. In its issue for June last we find the following paragraph: "Some people are anxious to know why we publish folk-stories. It is not so much for their value as folk-lore as for the number of old words not to be found in dictionaries, which they contain. We would venture to say that each of the recent issues of the Journal contains over a score of ancient Gaelic words which are now put on record, translated and explained for the first time. It is only by continuing to collect in this way that we can obtain the materials for a good, modern Irish dictionary."

In the same number we find an article on the "Ancient Irish Divisions of the Year," which, it seems to us, furnishes a good example of solid, scientific work, and shows what progress it is possible to make in Celtic philology and antiquities beyond what has been accomplished even by such masters in this department as Drs. O'Connor and O'Donovan.

The "Gaelic Journal" is published at the expense of its editor, Rev. Eugene O'Growney, M.R.I.A., Maynooth College, Ireland, to whom all communications (including subscriptions) should be addressed. The subscription is 6s. (\$1.50) a year, and all but a few of the back numbers are still procurable.

---

LIFE OF BLESSED JOHN GABRIEL PERBOYRE, Priest of the Congregation of the Mission. Martyred in China, September 11, 1840. Translated from the French. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1894.

Had China, in her day of grace, accepted the good tidings offered to her time and again by a long series of zealous apostles, she would not now be presenting to the world an unparalleled example of the rigor of divine vengeance. But she chose to close her ears to the heavenly message. Her soil is drunk with the blood of saints. Together with the faith, she refused to accept the civilization of Christianity. The consequence is a total collapse of her colossal power.

The present volume narrates, in language of touching simplicity, the virtuous life and cruel martyrdom of a missionary of the current century. The story opens "amid the fertile vine-clad hills of France," where Blessed John Gabriel was born, in 1802, and after a rapid sketch of the childhood, education, religious vocation, novitiate, and early priestly labors of the future martyr, carries us to the extreme East, where, chiefly in the saint's own pathetic utterances, it gives a graphic description of missionary struggles in the very centre of the vast pagan empire. It is impossible to read the narrative of the saint's exquisite sufferings and terrible martyrdom without the deepest feeling of sympathy, mingled with intense admiration, for that faith which renews in our own generation the triumphs of the early days. It is a story which should be told to children and adults in school and church.

---

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE. By *Rev. O. L. Jenkins, A.M., S.S.* Edited by *Rev. G. E. Viger, A.M., S.S.* Eighth edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.
- LET US GO TO THE HOLY TABLE. By *Rev. J. M. Lambert*, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Sacrament. Second edition. New York: Benziger Brothers. 30 cents net.
- THE CATHOLIC GIRL IN THE WORLD. By *Whyte Aves*, with a preface by *Very Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE DEVOTION. From the French of *Rev. J. N. Gron, S. J.* By *Rev. A. Clinton, S. J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LEGENDS AND STORIES OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS FROM MANY LANDS. By *A. Fowler Lutz*. New York: Benziger Brothers. Price, \$1.00.
- A HISTORY OF THE MASS. By *Rev. John O'Brien, A.M.* Fifteenth edition. New York, etc.: Benziger Brothers. \$1.25 net.
- THE FLOWER OF THE FLOCK AND THE BADGERS OF BELMONT. By *Maurice F. Egan*. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LIFE OF MARY MONHOLLAND, One of the Pioneer Sisters of the Order of Mercy in the West. Chicago: Hyland & Co.
- JESUS THE GOOD SHEPHERD. By *Right Rev. L. De Goesbriand, D.D.* New York: Benziger Brothers. 75 cents net.
- THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES. By *Dr. J. M. Rice*. New York: Century Co.
- THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR. By *Mrs. Abel Ram*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- MOSTLY BOYS. Short stories. By *Francis J. Finn, S. J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XX.—APRIL, 1895.—No. 78.

---

## THE CORRELATION OF ORDER AND JURISDICTION.

ANGLICANS are feeling somewhat confused. Lord Plunket, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, has just introduced his own personal jurisdiction into (what Anglicans would call) the national Church of Spain, while, at the same time, the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of the Catholic Church in Great Britain as "the Italian mission," and the Archbishop of York speaks of Cardinal Vaughan as "an Italian cardinal who calls himself Archbishop of Westminster." Here is an evident bewilderment as to jurisdiction. If the theory of national churches, in the Anglican sense, is to be vindicated by any sort of consistency, Lord Plunket cannot justify his innovation; but we have not heard that either of the English archbishops has convicted him of trying to make a schism, nor so much even as reproached him for his egotism. And yet the Archbishop of Canterbury must be supposed to look unfavorably on Lord Plunket's "Irish mission" in Spain, while the Archbishop of York must be presumed to be skeptical as to the jurisdiction of Lord Plunket's nominee. How are we to get straight upon these confusions? High Church Anglicans are vexed with Lord Plunket, and yet cannot see their way to reprimand him. They know that their theory of national churches is purely political, not spiritual; the *jus divinum* having become absorbed into the *jus civile*; and, though they would be glad to find an escape out of the anomaly, they are bound hand and foot by actual facts. Is it not possible to aid them in an extrication? Cardinal Vaughan has just told them that they have not a true priesthood, and Pope Leo XIII. has just earnestly invited them to return to the unity of the Catholic Church; but this question

VOL. XX.—15



of "jurisdiction" does not engage the Anglican mind as being really inclusive of all difficulties. If we can show that the bishops of the Church of England have not so much as a semblance of jurisdiction, we shall be showing at the same time that the Anglican claim to be Catholic is totally devoid of foundation.

# I.

St. Thomas says: "Spiritual power is twofold, one sacramental, the other jurisdictional." Suarez says: "The pontifical power is, as it were, the primal example of all spiritual power of jurisdiction, for no one will deny that that is a true power of active jurisdiction; nay, in that order is the highest that can exist in mere man." He adds that "the proper power of jurisdiction is granted to other bishops by election or simple concession, not by consecration . . . the episcopal power being but a certain participation of the papal power." Order, therefore, does not confer jurisdiction. The Anglican Bishop Horseley said well: "The power of order is properly a capacity of exercising the power of jurisdiction conferred by a competent authority." This is a lucid way of saying that a man irregularly ordained, albeit he may be in possession of true order, is not commissioned to use these spiritual powers as a representative of Catholic authority. "Orders may be seized upon in defiance of authority, but they carry with them no valid jurisdiction" is as obvious as it is a time-honored truism. If it were not a truism, then any bishop might intrude on any diocese; any bishop might transfer his personal allegiance to any bishop whom he might happen to prefer; and any layman might question the spiritual authority of any priest or bishop who was set over him. Even in temporal matters it is manifest that jurisdiction must dominate all kinds of social order. Queen Victoria has lawful authority in her own dominions; but she cannot exercise that lawful authority in America. A judge cannot pass sentence outside the defined sphere within which his jurisdiction has been limited. Professional men cannot practice till they have received their diplomas; nor can soldiers or sailors take the command unless they have been duly commissioned. The principle of jurisdiction is recognized by all men equally as to things spiritual and temporal; only High Churchmen will insist that spiritual jurisdiction may be derived from an authority which is not spiritual.

The controversy then being limited within the one simple enquiry, "What constitutes a competent authority?" we ought not to experience much difficulty. It would be strange, indeed, if there existed much difficulty, seeing that the answer must determine the alternative, whether we are Catholics or schismatics. If we may say so, it seems unlikely that Almighty God would have

left us in doubt as to a first principle. Schism being the separating from lawful authority and schism being, as Anglicans affirm, a "deadly sin," we might naturally expect that the authority which can judge of schism should be as conspicuous as is the sun at noonday. A soldier has no doubt as to who is his commander-in-chief; nor can a spiritual soldier be possibly less assured as to who is his supreme living authority. We assert, then, that the source of jurisdiction must be so assured as to admit of no controversy. And this is the truth we would demonstrate.

## II.

What constitutes a competent authority? In this question authority is assumed; there is only the question as to competency. Now jurisdiction has been defined as "the moral power of ruling those who are subject to you." But this moral power is twofold: (1) the power to make laws and to enforce them in regard to external government or discipline; (2) the power to pass sentence, spiritually, on one who has been made subject to your jurisdiction. But whence did this moral power proceed? "Feed my sheep" was the divine origin of jurisdiction. It had nothing to do with order, episcopal or sacerdotal; it was exclusively the grant of jurisdiction. And the successors of St. Peter, so soon as they are elected, receive power to exercise jurisdiction, that is, acts of external jurisdiction; for, as Suarez says, "Acts of pontifical jurisdiction, as such, are not acts of order or consecration, nor flow from it; so neither are acts of episcopal jurisdiction." Thus, "*ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia*," as St. Ambrose so tersely expressed it, is the postulate of all true jurisdiction. We go back to the fountain, to the source. Without a fountain, without a source, there can be no continuance. And just as, in the Catholic Church, we know the origin of jurisdiction, and therefore know whence and how it is now derived, so outside the Catholic Church there can be no true jurisdiction, because the fountain, the source, has been repudiated.

But can it be shown, historically, that this first principle of jurisdiction has been recognized always by all Catholics? It will be better, in attempting to answer this question, that we limit ourselves solely to English history; for otherwise the inquiry would lead us to great lengths, and scores of books have rendered the effort unnecessary. Besides, it is exclusively with reference to the Anglican establishment that we desire to consider this question, our whole point being the correlation or congruity of the Anglican order and jurisdiction.

Now no one denies that Pope St. Gregory the Great *claimed* jurisdiction over England. But our Ritualist friends are very quick

with the rejoinder, "True, but he had no *right* to claim it." Our answer is, How was it possible he should claim it unless (1) he knew that he had the right, and unless (2) he knew that all men would concede it? The objection that the British, who were at enmity with the Saxons, refused to receive an emissary through the Saxons, and refused also, as Venerable Bede says, in their "unspeakable wickedness," to preach the Gospel to their still pagan enemies, does not in any way affect the fact that all Christian peoples acknowledged the divine supremacy of the Pope. And this supremacy being acknowledged, as even the Ritualists do not deny, a long while before the mission of St. Augustine—acknowledged by the whole Christian world—one of two things must necessarily follow: (1) either the claim of St. Gregory was a just claim, or (2) the whole of Christendom had for a long while been deceived. But how was such a deception even possible? How was it possible that in such very early centuries—a goodly period of twelve hundred years ago—the whole Catholic Church should have got so utterly wrong upon the primary question of authority as to permit a bishop of Rome to claim the supreme power and not only to permit but to acquiesce? King Henry VIII. admirably disposed of this hypothesis in his famous "Answer" to the apostate Martin Luther. In his "Defence of the Seven Sacraments" he said to Martin Luther (only three years before the time when the charms of Ann Boleyn bewitched the king's soul and intelligence): "When Luther so impudently asserts, and this against his former declaration, that the Pope has no kind of power over the Catholic Church, no, not so much as human, but that he has by sheer force usurped the sovereignty, I greatly wonder how he should expect his readers to be either so credulous or dull as either to believe that a priest without any weapon or company to defend him, as doubtless he was before he became possessed of that which Luther says he has usurped, could ever have hoped to gain, without any right or title, such empire over so many bishops, his equals, in so many different and distant nations; or that all people should believe that all cities, kingdoms, provinces, had been so reckless of their own affairs, rights, and liberties, as to give to a strange priest an amount of power over them, such as he could have hardly dared to hope for." It is more than three centuries since Henry VIII. wrote so sensibly; and it was a thousand years earlier still when Pope St. Gregory wrote to St. Augustine: "Your Brotherhood will, moreover, have subject to you not only the bishops whom you or the Bishop of York may ordain but *all* the bishops of Britain by authority of our God and Lord Jesus Christ." Again: "Over the bishops of Gaul we give you no authority . . . but with respect to the bishops

of Britain we commit them all to your Brotherhood." And if it be asked by whose authority was the primacy of England affixed forever to the See of Canterbury, the answer is, by the authority of Pope Boniface, who, writing to St. Justus, successor of St. Augustine, said: "We confirm and command that the metropolitan See of all Britain be forever after in the See of Canterbury." Now to assume that such an exercise of authority—done in the face of the whole of Christendom—was, as Protestants express it, "a usurpation," is to assume (1) that "all peoples, cities, kingdoms, provinces had been reckless of their own affairs," as Henry VIII. wrote with admirable sarcasm; (2) that, within three centuries of the Church's issuing from the Catacombs, the whole of Christendom had become deluded upon the most important of all questions, the question of the supreme teaching authority; and that therefore (3) our Divine Lord had broken His promises to His Church almost immediately upon its emerging from its infancy; permitting the gates of hell to prevail against it, not only as to one truth or two truths, but as to the only possible security for all truths—the living authority which defines them.

The *doctrine* and the *fact* of the papal jurisdiction, throughout the whole history of the Catholic Church in England, were never dissociated for a moment. As to the doctrine, we have not space to quote Lanfranc, Venerable Bede, Alcuin, St. Anselm, St. Aldhelm, St. Wilfrid, St. Thomas, Archbishop Bradwardine, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and hosts of other doctors and theologians. Let us limit our quotations to two authorities, both of whom every Anglican should respect. First, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (A.D., 1535), being commanded to acknowledge the primacy of the apostate Henry VIII., spoke his mind at full length in the Upper House of Convocation; and the following are brief extracts from his speech: "To *thee* will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven! Now, my lords, can we say unto the King, *Tibi*, to *thee* will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven? If you say yes, where is your warrant? If you say no, you have answered yourselves that you cannot put such keys into such hands. . . . Again, my lords, can any of us say unto the King, *pasce oves*? . . . And it is not a few ministers of an island that must constitute a head over the universe; or, at least, by such example we must allow as many heads over the Church as there are sovereign powers, and then what will become of the supremacy? . . . The Council of Constantinople did acknowledge Pope Damasus . . . the Council of Ephesus did acknowledge Pope Celestin . . . the Council of Chalcedon did acknowledge Pope Leo . . . and now shall we acknowledge another head, or one head to be in England and another in Rome? . . . And shall we cause our king

to be the head of the Church, which all good kings abhorred the very least thought thereof, and so many wicked kings have been plagued for so doing? . . . If this thing be, farewell to all unity with Christendom; for as that blessed martyr St. Cyprian saith: 'All unity depends upon the authority of that Holy See, as upon the authority of Peter's successors.'"

Our second witness shall be Heath, Archbishop of York. And our reason for choosing him is that the present Anglican Archbishop of York has just spoken of Cardinal Vaughan as "an Italian cardinal who calls himself Archbishop of Westminster." Now, Archbishop Heath lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and when the Act of Supremacy was proposed, declaring the Queen to be Supreme Governor of the Church of England, Heath (and all the bishops were of one mind with him) protested against such enormity in these words: "By the forsaking and fleeing from the See of Rome, we must first forsake and flee from all general councils; secondly, all canonical and ecclesiastical law; thirdly, the judgment of all Christian princes; fourthly, the unity of Christ's Church; and, by falling out of Peter's ship, hazard ourselves to be drowned in the waters of schism, sects, divisions." Now one reflection only shall be made upon these testimonies, for it is a reflection that no Anglican cares to make. It is manifest that the bishops in the days of Henry VIII., and the bishops in the days of Queen Elizabeth, must have known a great deal more of the history of the Church in England—history both as to doctrine and as to fact—than the Protestant-born Ritualists of the present day. And the same remark is true of all the martyrs—of such men, for example, as Sir Thomas More, the most accomplished English gentleman of his day—who died for their fidelity to the old faith. *They* had not been fed on the Thirty-Nine Articles, nor nourished on the Form of Common Prayer; their whole hearts and souls were Catholic from their baptism, from their first confession, from their first Communion; and their whole intellects were rarified by their legitimate inheritance of the whole of the uncorrupted Catholic faith. *They* knew what was "Catholic" better than do the Ritualists, and, knowing it, they died rather than protestantize; died rather than call themselves High Churchmen or Ritualists, or by some such fantastic insularism as Anglo-Catholics.

### III.

We pass now from jurisdiction to order, so that we may be able to associate the two together and show why the Church of England lacks both. It would be wearisome to go over the old ground of the insufficiency of Parker's ordination, of the insufficiency of

the ordinals of King Edward, of the contempt of the Anglican reformers for a sacrificing priesthood or of the total rejection of Catholic doctrine and practice affirmed by the Articles and Prayer Book. Let us confine ourselves to what we may call the *moral* arguments—more powerful, perhaps, than even the arguments which are derived either from history or from theology.

Let it be granted that Anglican orders are valid. Now, what would be the consequence of this postulate?

It would follow that, for three hundred years, the Church of England possessed a priesthood without knowing it. Preaching Sunday after Sunday against the Catholic priesthood, reviling the Mass and speaking evil of the Confessional, administering a "communion" (at very long intervals) which was declared to be *not* the Catholic communion but only a commemoration of the Lord's Supper, allowing the consecrated crumbs to be scattered about the communion rails (an accident inseparable from the Anglican practice) and permitting the parish clerk to treat the remnants on the paten, and also the remnants in the chalice, with no more respect than he would show at his own breakfast table, using a "table" instead of an "altar" for the ministration, and being most careful to warn the communicants that there was no Real Presence, but that our Lord was received "by faith only" and "in the heart"; the Anglican clergy have for three centuries declared that they were *not* priests, but only ministers or parsons or reverend gentlemen.

Let us go deeper still. The "character" and the "office" of a true priest must of necessity have a good deal in common. We all know what we mean by a Catholic priest—a man set apart by his character quite as much as he is by his office. He is unmarried. He is dissociated from social trammel and conventionalism. The very reproach which has been cast against him by Englishmen (for three centuries) is that he is not a domestic or family man. He has been reviled for no other reason than that he has lived above nature and presumed to look upon his priesthood as supernatural. It is this "priesthood" which has been his reproach; this very priesthood which Anglicans now assure us belongs equally to Protestants and Catholics. And as to the "character" of the Anglican clergy—we use the word character in priestly sense and without the slightest reference to personal merit—we may certainly say that anything less supernatural it would be simply impossible to imagine. The average schoolboy transformed into the undergraduate, the average undergraduate transformed into the curate, the average curate transformed into the married man, the average married man transformed into the dignitary—into the apron'd and gaiter'd dean or bishop, opulent

in spirit, aristocratic in pretension, connubial in habit and comfortable in home ; an Anglican clergyman, from his cradle to his grave, has been almost everything in the world except a priest, spite of his many natural virtues or good points. In short, if we place, side by side, the two types, the English Catholic priest since the Reformation and the English Protestant clergyman since the Reformation, we find the two "characters" as exactly opposite as the two "offices," and yet the two characters always consistent with their offices, never confused nor intermixed for a single moment.

This is a moral argument of such surprising significance that it needs only natural instinct to apprehend it. But now to go further. This new theory of the identity of the Anglican ministry with the priesthood of the Catholic Roman Church involves the following startling contradictions: The *same* priesthood has taught that there are seven sacraments, and yet that five out of the seven are not sacraments, but only "a corrupt following of the apostles." The *same* priesthood has taught that baptism both is and is not the spiritual regeneration of the soul, that confirmation is both the sacrament of the Holy Ghost and yet a renewal only of the vows made by God-parents, that an integral confession in the sacrament of penance is necessary for the forgiveness of mortal sins ; while yet the sacrament of penance is such a shocking impropriety that all Anglican bishops, rectors and curates have warned their flocks to shun it as "a soul-destroying error," and have consequently never once thought of administering it ; that divine worship means the sacrifice of the Mass, while yet the same sacrifice is an idolatrous invention, "a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit" ; that transubstantiation is a divine fact, while yet it is a Popish figment and superstition ; that holy order is (mainly) the conferring of the two powers of consecrating and of absolving from sin, while yet the consecrated elements remain unchanged, nor has any priest the power to absolve ; that marriage is both a Christian sacrament and a union which is dissoluble by civil judges ; that extreme unction is both a Christian sacrament and yet such a "corrupt following of the Apostles" that no Anglican has ever remembered its existence ; and, finally, the *same* priesthood has believed of the Reformation that it was the greatest outbreak of the powers of darkness which Christendom has known for fifteen centuries—resulting in an "abomination of desolation" such as neither in doctrine nor in practice could be surpassed—while yet, at the same time, it was "the blessed Reformation," the substituting of the pure gospel for corrupt popery and the new birth of liberty and enlightenment.

All this, and a good deal more, must follow from the theory

that the Catholic and Anglican orders are identical, a maze of contradictions which, on the method of *quia absurdum*, would prove the fact of non-identity to demonstration.

#### IV.

Our point being the correlation of order and jurisdiction, we have tried to show that the Anglican bishops and clergy must be devoid of both the one and the other. But we should wish now to work the two points together; to show that the want of order is fatal to jurisdiction, while the want of jurisdiction, though not fatal to order, is fatal to the due exercise of order.

Let us take an example in recent history. The new Anglican See of Liverpool was founded by act of Parliament. Its first bishop, Dr. Ryle, was appointed by Lord Beaconsfield. The See, therefore, was created by the civil power, and the jurisdiction of the bishop was created by a temporal peer—the author of “Coningsby” and “Lothair.” Now, assuming Dr. Ryle to have been a true bishop, was he true Bishop of Liverpool? If so, then the Catholic bishop was an intruder. This narrows the inquiry to the simple question, Has the English Parliament or the Pope the greater right of creating a See, and has the Prime Minister or the Pope the greater right of jurisdiction—the greater right that is, of conferring jurisdiction? If we accept the Anglican theory, then the plenitude of the apostolic authority must reside, not in a spiritual, but in a civil power. This would be equally absurd with contending that the plenitude of the civil authority must reside not in a king but in a pontiff. Every one knows that a king or a parliament or a prime minister—or a score of all three put together—cannot possess a shred of apostolic authority. If they did, then might Nero have claimed the jurisdiction over the Christian Church of the Rome of his day or the Sultan of Turkey might now appoint Christian bishops within the limits of his restricted autonomy. But to escape from the dilemma some Anglicans affirm that jurisdiction is derived *from* the See, leaving the question unanswered, From what authority does the See itself derive its lawful tenure or existence? Catholics have no difficulty in answering such questions, their position being logical and unassailable. A See itself can only derive its right of being a See from the authority of the pontiff who created it; the bishop of any See can only derive his jurisdiction from the authority of the pontiff who approved him; while, as to the pontiff himself, his jurisdiction is derived neither mediately nor immediately from any human authority nor from his See nor from the will of the Catholic Church, but immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence it follows that the jurisdiction of all bishops, save the pontiff, is limited



within a prescribed region or area; the Archbishop of Westminster having no power to grant a mission to any ecclesiastical person outside Westminster. Indeed, it would seem that the Archbishop of Canterbury is the only archbishop or primate who claims a universality of jurisdiction, sending bishops to Gibraltar or Corca, with an assumption of the plenitude of apostolicity. And it is just here that the lack of order and the lack of jurisdiction meet in their most striking combination. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, having no order, cannot possess any jurisdiction, and, conversely having no jurisdiction, the order which he (hypothetically) confers is void of all legitimate exercise.

But we would say a word more on the *history* of this anomaly. The origin of the Anglican jurisdiction, like the origin of the Anglican order, was the accident of Queen Elizabeth's illegitimacy. Cardinal Pole had, in Queen Mary's reign, absolved the nation from schism and heresy, and restored it to the communion of the Church. But Queen Elizabeth, compelled by her illegitimacy, tore the nation once more from Catholic unity; risking her own soul, and the souls of her subjects, in order that she might reign forty years. So reluctant was the nation to return to schism, that a packed parliament could only secure a small majority of three in favor of the apostate oath of royal supremacy; all the bishops, the universities, the whole body of Catholic clergy, and all the laity who dared to speak their mind, protesting against the hideous impiety. Thus it was by act of parliament alone that the ancient faith, the ancient hierarchy, the ancient liturgy were swept away, and the present doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the new Church were established as parliamentarily sound. It is just here that jurisdiction and holy order seem to contend for the mastery in confusion. Six of Elizabeth's theologians being consulted as to the validity of the new orders, gave it as their opinion that "in a case of such urgent necessity the queen possessed the power of supplying every defect through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority as head of the Church." In other words, these Protestant theologians maintained the perfectly original theory that true jurisdiction being wanting for the new order, a false jurisdiction must be pronounced true. The new order, they said, is certainly equivocal; we admit that it is not in the least like Catholic order; but, as we have thrown over the pontiff's jurisdiction, which could alone decide the question authoritatively, one alternative alone remains to us: we must affirm that the queen's jurisdiction is *more* divine than the pontiff's jurisdiction; so that the queen can henceforth teach the pontiff, rebuke the pontiff, even anathematize him, "in the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority as head of the Church." And if it be replied, "Yes, this was the attitude of

Elizabeth, but so far only as the Church of England was concerned," our answer is: You first create a new national church, in the teeth of the opposition of the whole nation, episcopal, sacerdotal, and lay—excepting only the small crowd of powerful worldlings who had become enriched by the spoils of the Catholic Church—and having done this, you say that the new jurisdiction remained as restricted as the new church. This may be perfectly true as a political fact, but it is none the less an apostasy and an absurdity. It is an apostasy because you make the fount of all spiritual jurisdiction to be insular, civil, and lay; and it is an absurdity because you affirm of the lesser that it can rule, and ought to rule, the greater. You take from God the things which are God's, and you give them to any turbulent Cæsar. You make a civil and a lay power to sit in judgment on a divine sacrament (for not even Henry VIII., before or after his excommunication, denied that holy order was a divine sacrament), and you give to an island-queen the power to "supply all deficiencies in the acts done by them" (her bishops), "or in the person or state, or faculty of any of them; such being the necessity of the case and the urgency of the time"; a power which never was claimed by any pontiff, and which every pontiff would have repudiated as an impiety. Thus you invert every process of common sense. You admit that it must belong to a divinely appointed jurisdiction to decide on faith, worship, and holy order, and yet affirm that it belongs to a queen or to a parliament to *create* that same divine jurisdiction whenever the "urgency of the time or the necessity of the case" seems to call for such spasmodic creation. "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are God's" is the new Anglican reading of the divine command. To pontifically define what is divine jurisdiction, and then to more than pontifically create it, was that Anglican assumption which accompanied the creation of a new church, a new faith, a new religion. Well might Montalembert say: "The Church of England was one of the most awful forms of sin and pride that has ever appeared in the world." All other forms of heresy had been based on the assumption that divine authority had misinterpreted a divine truth; but Elizabethanism was based on the assumption that the civil power could *create* divine authority, and could then license this divine authority to teach whatever truths were most agreeable to its tastes or its ease.

## V.

Archbishop Parker, the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury, used to "take a pleasure," as Strype tells us in *Parker's Life*, "sometimes to recollect how he was consecrated, and that he was the first of all the archbishops of Canterbury that came

into that See without any spot or stain of popish superstition and vain ceremonies required of all before him, without any bull or approbation from the Pope of Rome." Sixty-nine archbishops of Canterbury had exercised their jurisdiction as primates by the authority of him who sent St. Augustine; but the appointment, the approbation of Parker, as well as his episcopal consecration, were all of them devoid of all authority, being contrary to all precedent, ritual and canon law, which had been venerated in the old English Church. No wonder that the Catholic bishops in the time of Queen Elizabeth turned their backs on such a travesty of Christianity. They refused to subscribe the oath of supremacy, which affirmed that the queen was "the only supreme governor in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes" and that "by this present parliament all such jurisdictions, *i.e.*, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority had heretofore been" became henceforth "united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm," with a great deal more of the same kind of profanity. Whereas, in all Catholic time, the Pope's jurisdiction had included authority to redress heresies, to institute or confirm bishops-elect and to receive appeals from the spiritual courts, henceforth, by parliamentary acts, the crown became the source of all spiritual jurisdiction and the judge of the purity of all doctrines. In other words, the Pope had no spiritual jurisdiction; but the crown had all spiritual jurisdiction. The crown became to the Church what it was to the State, and to deny that it had become so was *ipso facto* to incur excommunication. Perhaps the story of Parker's pretended consecration has furnished the most practical illustration of the worthlessness of this spurious jurisdiction. Parker's four consecrators—excommunicated regulars—who had no more jurisdiction, ecclesiastically speaking, than they had belief in the sacrament of holy order, were supposed, by the queen's patent, to confer the same jurisdiction as St. Gregory had conferred on St. Augustine. This is about as irrational as would be the pretension of four culprits to confer jurisdiction on a judge. Putting aside the fact of Parker's consecrators being excommunicated and of their being—as the Anglican rector, Dr. Lee, does not hesitate to call all the reformers, "unredeemed villains"—they had no more power to create an archbishop than a deserter would have to create a general. Probably the utmost reach of burlesque that ever was known in sacred things was the consecration of Parker by unfrocked monks, unless, indeed, the jurisdiction which he derived from such imposition be not a more wonderful stretch of comedy or of imagination.

We need not pursue further a distasteful subject, and yet it is necessary for a moment to dwell upon the hazards which this new

theory of priesthood involves. Some of the Ritualist clergy now hear confessions. Apart from the extreme danger of a Protestantly educated clergyman, who has had no preparation for such an office, being made the confidant of the confessions of penitents, and apart from the moral certainty that such an unprepared clergyman has no orders which would confer such priestly powers, there remains the fact that the absence of jurisdiction must render his absolution null and void. To quote the words of Father Breen, O.S.B., in his "Letter to a Friend:" "It is a first principle in theology, admitted by all theologians, that to confer or receive lawfully any sacrament, in ordinary cases, besides valid order ecclesiastical jurisdiction is also necessary and that its absence renders the administration of the sacrament of penance not only unlawful but even invalid." Here, then, exists more than a sufficient reason why Anglicans should not "go to confession" to Anglicans. It is not only a case of a layman confessing to a layman and of a confessor being as little fitted for his office as the penitent is ill at ease in his confidence; there is the further consideration that, jurisdiction being wanting, absolution cannot be granted by the confessor. What a waste, then, of the best intentions, the best efforts! Admirable, truly sincere and often heroic as are these struggles to get back to a Catholic sacrament, we can only hope that their merit may obtain the supreme grace of a speedy conversion to the Catholic Church.

A. F. MARSHALL.



## INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

"SIC VOS NON VOBIS."

(THIRD ARTICLE.<sup>1</sup>)

THE sachems of the Pequots, of the Narragansetts, of the Wampanoags or Pokanokets, of the Massachusetts, and of the Pawtucketts, were the five political rulers dominating all other Indian nations living upon what now constitutes New England's main lands and the islands included within her present boundaries. This was before the advent of the white race.

The Pequots, the most numerous and perhaps the most warlike of these Indian powers, possessed the territory since known as Connecticut, having their chief canton where the picturesque city of New London now stands. They dominated the contiguous nations, and on the shores of the Connecticut River and parts of Long Island.

The Narragansetts, second in importance, had their chief cantons on the shores of Narragansett Bay and Canonicut Island.

They ruled the nations of the bays, the islands, and of the inland regions from the eastern border of the Pequots' domain, including Rhode Island, Block Island, and parts of Long Island.

The Wampanoags, third in importance, had their domain and cantons east and northwest of the Narragansetts; they controlled the nations inhabiting Nantuckett, Martha's Vineyard, Nawsett, Mannamoyk, Sawkattuckett, and other minor tribes.

The Massachusetts, fourth in importance, were the original lords of the soil constituting the State which perpetuates their name and identifies their memory with some of the most important events in North American history.

They were a numerous and great people, living northward of the Wampanoags, and their principal cantons, which were the first to be encroached upon by the Puritan colonists, were clustered on the shores of Massachusetts Bay.

They dominated the Weechagaskas, Neponsitts, Punkapaogs, Nonantums, Nashaways, and some tribes of the Nipmucks. They were hostile to the Narragansetts, and allied with the Pawkunawkutts, who were south of them, and with the Pawtucketts, who lived on the northeast of their border.

The Pawtucketts, fifth in relative standing, occupied the country north and northeast of the Massachusetts, and dominated the

<sup>1</sup> See the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for October, 1893, vol. xviii., 698, and for July, 1894, vol. xix., 545.

Pennakooks, Agawomes, Naamkeeks, Pascatawayes, Accomintas, and tribes of other nations. The Pawtucketts' domain was the next, after that of the Massachusetts, to be encroached upon and subsequently occupied by the Puritan colonists.<sup>1</sup>

All these Indian nations used a general language having local dialects.

The five sachems of the Pequots, Narragansetts, Wampanoags, Massachusetts, and Pawtucketts, held sway over their subordinate nations by the power of their warriors and by traditionary right of control; they were rarely at peace with each other. Had they united their forces into an armed confederacy, such as was the Iroquoian at a corresponding time, and united in opposing the white intruders on their respective domains, it is doubtful if the English Puritans could have established the permanent settlements they had succeeded in making. Without such union they were unable single-handed to resist the power of the whites, who crushed one after another of these sachems; the leading and most ambitious, and the most numerous of the combinations, the Pequots, being the first to experience the fate reserved for all, and were conquered and dismembered as early as 1637.

During the interval of peace ensuing, was commenced the missionary effort to convert the Massachusetts Indians. This missionary work became coincident with the inception of the "Algonquian Bibliography," so far as this related to publications by English authors during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These prints were more or less connected with religious work in behalf of the Indians; which beginning, as stated, soon after the conquest of the Pequot sachem, and interrupted by subsequent wars, was ended when there were no longer any Indian tribes left on New England soil; when in fact the New England nations had become obliterated.

But the attention of the general reader, and of the historical student in particular is directed to the fact that these Puritan missions were contemporary, first, with the Catholic missions of Huronia, and second, with the glorious and chivalric, if not romantic, crusade of the Jesuit fathers in the Iroquoian cantons, who, at the peril of their lives, bore the standard of the Cross, which they erected successively in every canton of the warriors of the Iroquoian Confederacy, in the "Country of the Lakes" of New York, from the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers to Lake Erie.

Probably no periods in the history of the North American Indians are more interesting in relation to their welfare and to their subsequent fate. For the immediate descendants of these races were destined to fall under English control.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Indian nomenclature is that of General Gookin, as quoted by Mr. Pilling in his *Algonquian Bibliography*, p. 176.

The one great character, and the most prominent actor, in the history of the failure of the efforts to convert and to civilize the Indian people ruled by the five great aboriginal sachems of New England; the man whose name stands out in bold relief in Puritan history as the apostle of mercy and of charity to the red men whose territory had been reft from them by the Puritan colonists—the name of this man is John Eliot.

He was born in Herfordshire, England, in 1604, graduated at Cambridge in 1622, and received orders in the Church of England, but became a dissenter and emigrated to Boston in 1631, where he was married the following year.

He was soon after accepted, ordained as a Puritan minister and assigned to the small pastorate of Roxbury, near Boston, where he remained during the entire course of his earthly career.

His interest in the welfare of the New England Indians was first made conspicuous by one of his sermons at Roxbury, in which he denounced the commissioners of the colony, who were the ruling power, for sharp practice on their part to the prejudice of the Pequot nation. This was in 1634.

For this he incurred the displeasure of the colonial magistrates and he was compelled to make a public apology. It is on record as an acknowledgment of his ability, that in 1639, he, in conjunction with Rev. Thomas Welde and Rev. Richard Mather, were appointed to prepare a new version of the Psalms of David in English metre, which work was printed and has since been generally known as the "Bay Psalm Book." This was the first book printed in the English-American colonies. Extending his interest in the native Indian to a more practical method, he instructed an intelligent young Pequot, living in Dorchester, in the English rudiments, and when satisfied with the mental capacity of his copper-hued student, he made him his own tutor in the study of the Indian dialects, with the general use of which he soon became familiar. In 1646 he commenced his missionary work by preaching to the Indians, in the vicinity of Boston, in their local dialect, and in the following year he made regular visits to the chief cantons of the five dominant Indian powers. Like nearly all Indian missionary labor, his initial experience was neither agreeable or satisfactory, and, moreover, it was not exempt from toil and danger. This was the beginning of the Puritan missions, as they may be called, in New England. An account of this work and a description of the field of its operations was sent to England, and in 1647 a society was chartered in London for its encouragement and support, officially "for the propagation of the gospel to the Indians of New England."

It was this London propaganda which supplied the means for subsequent missionary work in New England by sending each

year funds and material to the commissioners of the colony. John Eliot was its apostle.

In the meantime the converted Indians were withdrawn from their respective homes and grouped in a settlement at Nonatum, in the vicinity of Boston; and in 1650 the Christian Indian town of Natic was founded, where all the converts were gathered and where the heads of families were assigned land, on which they built homes and cultivated the soil for their support; a tribal form of government was established among them.

After nine years of probation this Natic community were deemed worthy and formally admitted to the Puritan fold. They were then permitted to form a church organization.

Natic became the headquarters of Eliot. He preached here regularly, established an Indian school and from its pupils he selected and prepared young Indian adepts to aid him in the missionary field.

Similar Indian convert communities were subsequently organized in New England under the auspices of Eliot and his zealous co-laborers, Mayhew, Bourne and Cotton.

The aid extended by the London propaganda enabled these missionaries to work among the Indians with partial success, but the war with Philip in 1675 utterly demoralized these efforts to civilize them.

The colonists became so insanely maddened against them, that a red man, whether a Christian convert or a Pagan, became the object of their deadly hatred and frequently met death at their hands at sight.

Even the peace-loving converts at Natic, who, for a quarter of a century, had been permitted to enjoy Christian fellowship in the Puritan fold, experienced this hatred to such an extent that to save them from being slaughtered, Eliot was obliged to tear them hastily from their homes and to provide a refuge for them near Boston.<sup>1</sup>

A worse fate met the unfortunate converts who had been grouped in other Christian communities. Despite the protests of Eliot, Mayhew, Bourne, Cotton and their co-workers, the converted Indians were driven from these settlements and compelled to seek a refuge in the forest and to undergo the persecutions of their Pagan enemies.

The lot of these unfortunates became a sad one; they were hunted out of their abodes by Puritan soldiers, and such as escaped death at their hands experienced it with torture from their savage persecutors.

After the downfall of Philip, Natic and some other convert settlements were repopulated and missionary work was resumed;

---

<sup>1</sup> On Deer Island, in Boston harbor.



but the native New Englanders had become suspicious of the sincerity of the white man; results were discouraging, little progress was made, although many native preachers and exhorters aided the missionaries.

The New England Indians were the first of their race on North American soil to experience the effects of their contiguity to the Anglo-Saxon race.

Their doom had been sealed. Their utter extinction had become only a question of time; the presence of a Christian Indian on the soil of his ancestors was disagreeable to the Puritan, and as occasion required, the wild tribes of the forest were chased and slaughtered without mercy. Natic, which had been the solace of Eliot's philanthropic heart, languished and decayed.

Its Indian population steadily diminished and its founder who had built so much upon its future, was destined to witness its partial extinction. Eliot had an Indian preacher ordained to succeed him; his successor continued to labor until 1716, when Natic, last of the converted Indian settlements on New England soil, ceased to exist as such, and so far as its Indian population was concerned, became a thing of the past.

Meantime, there had been no lack of funds for missionary work in New England; the London propaganda had rather increased their liberal contributions, which they sent each year to the Commissioners of the Colonies; whether these functionaries were in sympathy with Eliot and his confrères, who had increased in number and efficiency, is a question.

But by the aid of these funds Eliot was enabled to compile and have printed in the Indian language at Cambridge, Mass., the religious, scriptural and philological works which remain a monument to his memory as a philanthropist and a scholar.

A notice of these works will appear in the chronological series arranged by Mr. Pilling.

The earliest English print described in the "Algonquian Bibliography," has a fac-simile of the title page; it is by Captain John Smith, of Virginia:

A Map of Virginia.  
WITH A DESCRIPTION  
OF the Country, the  
Commodities, People, Govern-  
ment and Religion.  
Written by Captaine Smith, sometimes Go-  
vernour of the Country. (sic).  
etc.

AT OXFORD.

Printed by Joseph Barnes, 1612. Small quarto, pp. 110. Copies were seen in the British Museum, Harvard and Lenox libraries.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A fine copy of this work was sold at the Murphy sale for \$180.

The next in chronological order is :

"Good nevvcs from New England: A true Relation of things very remarkable at the Plantation of Plimoth in Nevv England. Shewing the wondrous providence and goodness of God in their preservation and continuance, being delivered from many apparent deaths and dangers," etc. By "Edward Winslow,"<sup>1</sup> London, 1624, printed for William Bladen and John Bellamie; to be sold at their shops at the Bible in Pauls Church Yard, and at the 3 Golden Lyons in Corn Hill, near the Royal Exchange." Small quarto, pp. 130.

Following the above are fac-similes of the beautiful designed title pages of Captain John Smith's—The

Generall Historie  
of

Virginia, New England and the Summer Isles, with the names of the Adventurers, Planters and Governours, from their first beginning in 1584 to this present, 1624, etc.  
London.

Printed for Michael Sparkes. Folio pp. 250. The second title page is for the edition of the same work of 1626. The designs are exquisite and contain medallions of Elizabeth, King James, and Prince Charles, coats of arms, etc., finely engraved. Copies of these editions were seen in the Brown, Congressional and Lenox libraries.<sup>2</sup>

Rosier's voyage, etc., 1625, is noted.

"New Englands Prospect," etc. With fac-simile of title page. London 1634, follows. Quarto, pp. 98. This work contains about 265 words in the Massachusetts Indian dialect and English; the names of the sachems, rivers, and places, etc., in the same dialect, by William Wood. Later editions of this work printed in 1635 and 1639 are also described. Next in order follows a fac-simile of the title page of

"A Key unto the  
LANGUAGE OF AMERICA.

Or an help to the language of the natives in that part of America called New England. Together with brief observations of the customs, manners and worships, etc., of the aforesaid natives in Peace and Warre, in Life and Death, etc."

By Roger Williams,  
Of Providence in New England.  
London, 1643. 24mo., pp. 200.

Mr. Pilling minutely describes the matter contained in each chapter. Copies were seen in Brown, Congressional, Harvard, Lenox, and other libraries.<sup>3</sup> Later editions and reprints are also described.

"The Day Breaking, if not the Sun rising of the gospell with

<sup>1</sup> The copy of this work in the Lenox library cost \$350.

<sup>2</sup> One of the five copies of this edition in the Lenox Library cost \$1800.

<sup>3</sup> A copy of this edition was sold at the Murphy sale for \$77.

the Indians in New England," etc. By Rev. Thomas Shepherd, London, 1647. Small quarto, pp. 25. Several reprints of this work in this country are described.

We have now reached the notice of the first of Mr. Eliot's Indian works, viz.:

"A primer or catechism in the Massachusetts Indian Language. By John Eliot. Cambridge, 1654: printed by Samuel Green." Mr. Pilling remarks, that it is the earliest printed book in the Massachusetts Indian language of which any record has been found. No copy is known to be extant. Probably 1000 were printed.

A second edition of this primer was printed by Mr. Green in 1662, comprising 1500 copies, not one of which is known to be extant.

A third edition was printed by Marmaduke Johnson in 1669, the only known copy of which is in the library of the University of Edinburgh. It contains 64 leaves, 32mo.

A fac-simile of the title page is given; the upper part in English, followed by

"Composed by J. E."

The lower part is in the Massachusetts Indian language. The English part of the title page reads as follows.

"THE INDIAN PRIMER"

or

The way of training up our Indian youth in the good knowledge of God, in the knowledge of the Scriptures and in the ability to Reade.

The contents of the copy referred to are minutely described. A fourth and larger edition of this catechism was printed at Cambridge by Samuel Green in 1687. No authentic copy of this edition is extant. "But in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society is a copy of Mr. Eliot's primer in the Massachusetts Indian language, supposed to be unique, which may be a copy of this edition. It is without title, name of place or printer, and also without date, but appears to have been complete in 40 leaves. Size of the leaf,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches high by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches wide." Fac-similes of 4 pages in Indian text are shown.<sup>1</sup>

The assembly's shorter catechism was also printed either before or after the last edition noted above. No copy of this catechism is known to be extant.

In 1655, Mr. Eliot translated and had published the Book of Genesis in the Massachusetts Indian dialect. Cambridge, Mass.: Printed by Samuel Green. But no copy is known to be extant. Neither is there to be found a copy of the Gospel of Matthew, translated and printed the same year. A few psalms in metre,

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 129.

translated and published in 1658, have also disappeared. No copy has been found.

"A Christian Covenanting Confession," a work translated by Mr. Eliot and printed in the Massachusetts Indian dialect by Samuel Green, Cambridge, 166—, is next described from an only known copy in the library of the University of Edinburgh. It is 7 by 5 inches, divided by lines. The text is minutely described and a fac-simile given of 2 of the leaves. The Indian text is on the left of a dividing line and the English on the right. Another edition of the same work was printed about ten years later, and the only copy supposed to be extant is in the Congregational Library at Boston, which is somewhat imperfect. It was Mr. Eliot's greatest desire that the Indians should have access to the Scriptures printed in their native dialect.

No one knew better than he did the time and labor requisite to prepare Scriptural matter for the press. He communicated his anxiety and his intention to commence this work to the propaganda in London, and he was encouraged to undertake a translation of the New Testament. The funds required for its production the propaganda agreed to provide.

The fac-simile of the title page in English, which Mr. Pilling produces, gives us a clear idea of what the original book was like. Its title page is a creditable piece of work for an American press nearly two and a half centuries ago :

"The New  
TESTAMENT  
of our  
LORD AND SAVIOR,  
JESUS CHRIST.  
Translated into the  
INDIAN LANGUAGE  
And  
Ordered to be printed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in  
NEW ENGLAND  
At the charge and with the consent of the  
CORPORATION IN ENGLAND  
For the Propagation of the Gospel in New England,  
Cambridg :<sup>1</sup>  
Printed by *Samuel Green* and *Marmaduke Johnson*,  
MDCLXI." (1661.)

The translator's name does not appear on the title page, which, when translated into the dialect of the natives, would have confused such of them as were able to read the matter printed after the title.

The testament is dedicated to Charles II. and has 130 printed leaves, small quarto.

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of this edition was priced in London in 1884 at \$525.

The fac-simile of the title page in the dialect abbreviated reads as follows:

" WUSKU  
WUTTESTAMENTUM  
NUL-LORDUMUN  
JESUS CHRIST  
Nuppoquohwuffuaencumun ;"

With printers' names and date in English.

Mr. Pilling devotes 4 closely-printed octavo pages to the history of all that connects with this edition and quotes from Dr. John H. Trumbull, Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan, the letters of Eliot, of the commissioners of the colony and of Governor Endicott. In one of the commissioners' letters they write: " In Generall wee haue bin enformed that about 100 of Mr. Elliott's (*sic*) Indians can read in the bible and many others about Plymouths Martin's vinyards and other places," etc. Of the edition of 1661 probably 1000 copies were printed and bound at a cost of £440.

In addition, 40 presentation copies with the Indian and English title and the dedication were bound and sent to the propaganda in London. Those inscribed were for Charles II., Lord Hyde, the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge, the Rev. Joseph Caryl and Rev. Richard Baxter. The disposition of the remaining copies was left to William Ashurst and Richard Hutchinson, officers of the propaganda.

Of the original edition only 16 copies are known to be extant. Of these, 2 only can be claimed to have been among the 1000 copies circulated among the New England Indians; one of them is in the Harvard Library and the other in the Lenox Library. The 14 remaining copies were among those sent to London at the time of publication and referred to above. Of these, 6 have been purchased by American collectors at a cost of about \$700 per copy, and are to be found in American private and collegiate libraries; and 8 are in the English, Scotch and Irish University Libraries, to whom they were originally presented by the London propaganda; and in the British Museum.

In the meantime, Mr. Eliot had not been idle. In 1653, he had put in press the Indian Bible, which connects his name with North American history. The Indian title page reads as follows:

" Mamusse wunneetupanatamwe up biblum God naneeswe nukkone testament kah wonk Wuskutestament. Ne quoshkinnumuk nashpe Wuttinneumoh Christ noh asoo-wesit John Eliot." Cambridge, etc., 1663.

It resembles the title page of the Testament of 1661.

There were bound with the Bible intended for circulation among the Indians: Mr. Eliot's translations of the " Psalms of David in Metre " and the " Rules for Christian Living "—the

whole edition amounting to about 1050 copies, of which 40 were sent to the officers of the London propaganda for presentation; it cost the latter association about £800 in the aggregate for this edition. A few copies were presented to prominent American parties and about 1000 copies remaining were circulated among the Indians of New England. Fac-similes are given of the first pages of the Psalms and of the rules. The whole Bible, with these additions, numbered 594 printed leaves in quarto.

Most of the copies of this edition known to be extant are to be found among the 40 originally sent to London.

In the subsequent wars with Philip this entire edition, save a few copies, was probably destroyed, and these latter are the only ones that can be positively traced to Indian ownership.

It is not fair to allege that the thousands of Testaments, Bibles, catechisms, hymn books and homilies which had been printed in the Indian language and circulated among the New England tribes were destroyed by Philip's warriors; it is quite probable that the intense hatred of the Puritan soldiers for the unfortunate red man, whether Pagan or Christian, was vented to some extent on the belongings of the latter.

Of the 1663 edition of Mr. Eliot's Indian Bible, Mr. Pilling claims there are 39 copies extant; these he describes in numerical order, giving their origin, history and present ownership.

Twenty-nine copies are known to be in collegiate and reference libraries in New York, New England and in the collections of wealthy bibliophiles. Of these 16 have been traced back to contemporaneous New England scholars and 13 to English sources.<sup>1</sup> Of the 10 copies remaining, 2 are in Holland, 1 each in the Duke of Devonshire's and Earl Spencer's libraries, and the others are in the English, Irish and Scotch Universities and in the British Museum.

In the description of these 39 copies Mr. Pilling has covered 10 closely-printed octavo pages of his bibliography.

Some of the copies existing are imperfect, others bound up with fragmentary parts of different editions. Some of these copies cost their American owners, according to condition, from \$200 to \$1500, while for the fine copy owned by Mr. Charles H. Kalbfleisch, of New York City, \$2900 was paid, which is about three times its weight in standard gold coin. This copy was originally in the library of the Earl of Hardwicke.

In 1680 a later edition of the Testament was printed, and in 1685 the whole Bible was revised and reprinted, as also other translations into Indian of religious books.

---

<sup>1</sup> The copy in the Brown University, Providence, R. I., was originally owned by Roger Williams.

These books were produced on new type, better paper, and they were all substantially bound, the whole expense to the propaganda being about £1000.

Fac-similes of the Indian title pages of the Bible and of the first pages of the Psalms and "rules" are given. The literal translation of the title page of the Bible, as given by Mr. Pilling is:

"The whole holy his Bible God, both Old Testament and also New Testament. This turned by the servant of Christ, who is called John Eliot. Second time amended impression, Cambridge, etc., 1685."

This translation is from Dr. Trumbull's "Origin and Early Progress of Indian Missions in New England."

Mr. Pilling describes numerically in 7 classes 55 copies of this issue known to be extant in America and Europe, giving a minute description of each, with its history and ownership. More than one-third are imperfect or mutilated. A number of copies owned by American bibliophiles have been rebound and restored at considerable expense by Samuel Bedford, of London, a specialist in such work.

The copies extant, however rare, are not considered so valuable as those of the original edition; 27 are in American institutions, 11 in European libraries, 1 in the Congressional library, and 16 in American collections of wealthy bibliophiles in the United States.

The cost of those owned by the latter has been from \$200 to \$1000. Of the copies owned in this country 27, including the imperfect copies, are traced to contemporaneous New England Puritan owners, and 28, which are in the best condition, were among the 40 originally sent the London propaganda in 1685. Time may develop other copies, says Mr. Pilling, whose description of those known to be extant occupies 11 closely printed octavo pages. It should be mentioned that of the edition of 1663, but one copy could be traced back to Indian ownership, and of the later edition 6 copies were found to have been owned by New England Indians during the early decades of the eighteenth century.

In 1663 Mr. Eliot wrote Mr. Richard Baxter, London, for permission to translate his "Call to the Unconverted" into the Massachusetts Indian dialect, which had been printed in London in 1657. Mr. Baxter consented, and the translation was printed by Green and Johnson, Cambridge, 1664. No copy of this edition is extant. It was reprinted in 1688 and a fac-simile of the title page in the Indian dialect is given by Mr. Pilling.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The copy of this little work in the library of Yale College cost \$135.

Bayly's "Practice of Piety" was next translated and published in 1665, and a later edition in 1685. Copies of these Indian works are quite rare; the few that are known to be extant are described.<sup>1</sup>

About the same time, at the suggestion of Hon. Robert Boyle, director of the London propaganda, Mr. Eliot commenced the compilation of an Indian grammar.

In this work he was assisted by his sons, John and Joseph. The fac-simile of the title page given by Mr. Pilling reads:

"The Indian Grammar begun; or, an Essay to bring the Indian Language into rules, For the Help of such as desire to Learn the same, for the furtherance of the Gospel among them by John Eliot." Scripture text follows. "Cambridge. Printed by Marmaduke Johnson, 1666."<sup>2</sup>

Small quarto, pp. 66. According to Dr. Trumbull, the Massachusetts Indian language was also spoken with some differences of dialect by the Wampanoags, the Narragansetts, the Niantics, the Indians of Martha's Vineyard, the Montauks, etc. Probably 500 copies were printed. Mr. Eliot was not satisfied with this grammar. Copies of this work are rare. In 1670 Mr. Eliot organized at Natic a class in logic and theology, to whom he lectured once a fortnight. The object of these lectures was to prepare the members of the class to study to advantage the Scriptures.

In connection with this work he published in 1672 "The Logic Primere" in English and Indian; fac-similes of 4 pages 32mo. are given. One thousand copies were printed and ultimately circulated among the Indians.

The only copy that Mr. Pilling could trace is in the British Museum.

In 1689, Mr. Eliot translated and had published another devotional book for the Indians, "The Sincere Convert," originally by Thomas Shepard, London, 1641. A fac-simile of the title-page is given by Mr. Pilling.<sup>3</sup>

Several other works in connection with his missionary labors were published in the English language by Mr. Eliot in America and in England.

"In the latter part of October, 1659, there was printed in London a book entitled "The Christian Commonwealth," which had been written by Mr. Eliot nine or ten years before.

After the restoration of Charles II., in 1660, the governor and council of Massachusetts colony considered that the republican

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of this work in Yale Library cost \$205.

<sup>2</sup> A copy of this grammar was sold in London in 1859 for \$227.

<sup>3</sup> The copy of this work in the Yale Library cost \$100.



sentiments of this publication, if allowed to pass unnoticed and unproved, might be represented to their disadvantage.

The book was therefore formally condemned and suppressed on the 18th of March, and in the following May a retraction, signed by Mr. Eliot, was made public.<sup>1</sup>

"The Sincere Convert" was the last of Mr. Eliot's publications. He died at Roxbury on the 21st of May, 1690, in the 86th year of his age.

Among the contemporaries of Mr. Eliot in the missionary field was Rev. Abraham Pierson, who published "Some Helps for the Indians," 8°, p. 67, in English and Indian. Cambridge: Samuel Green, 1658.

A larger edition of this work was printed by Mr. Simmons, in London, 1659.

Fac-similes of the title pages of both editions are given from copies in the British Museum.

A letter from William Penn, descriptive of the people of Pennsylvania, colonists, and Indians, and a full description of the latter, their language, customs, manners, habitations, etc., folio p. 10, London, 1683, is next described, as also three subsequent editions of the same in English, two in Dutch, one in German, one in Scandinavian and one in French. Several editions of Mr. Penn's subsequent works containing linguistic matter are also described, showing that he was a fair student of the Indian dialects of his time. After Mr. Eliot's time, there came on the editorial platform of Indian missionary work a school of Puritan ministers whose books have a place in the Algonquian bibliography, and whom Mr. Pilling mentions in their chronological order.

Rev. Grindal Rawson, whose work :

"Spiritual Milk for Babes, Drawn from the Breasts of Both Testaments for the Nourishment of their Souls," originally written by John Cotton and now turned into Indian language for the benefit of Indian children, by Grindal Rawson, minister of the gospel among the Indians, p. 44, Cambridge, 1691

is described with a fac-simile of the title pages in English and Indian.<sup>2</sup>

A confession of faith, 1699, in Indian, by the same author, is also described.

Of the same school was Samuel Danforth, whose "Greatest Sinners Called and Encouraged," in English and Indian, 8°, pp. 164, printed in Boston, 1693, is noted with fac-simile. "The Woful Effects of Drunkness," by the same author, in Indian and

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Language*, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> The copy of *Milk for Babes* in the Yale College Library cost \$85.

English, printed in Boston, 1710, is also noted with fac-simile of title page.<sup>1</sup>

Rev. Cotton Mather is next noted: "An Epistle to the Christian Indians," etc., in the Indian language, Boston, 1700, pp. 14, 16°, and a similar work in 1706.

"Family Religion Excited and Assisted," in double verse, English and Indian, 16°, pp. 20, Boston, 1714, with fac-similes Indian and English. "India Christiana," a discourse to the Commissioners, etc., on Indian missions, by the same author, and published in English, Indian and Latin, pp. 94, 16°, Boston, 1721. Fac-similes are given of title pages and of page 52.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Pilling describes an earlier work of Mr. Mather: "A Monitor for Communicants," of which no copy is extant, and remarks: Mr. Mather is best known, probably, by his numerous published writings, numbering over 400 separate books and tracts. His library was the largest of any in America at that time, and his learning was more varied and extensive than that of any of his contemporaries in New England.

His piety, talents and industry were considered wonderful; but, notwithstanding these attainments, it is evident, as one of his biographers remarks, "that his judgment was not equal to his other faculties." He was weak, credulous, superstitious, vain and conceited; and his passions, which were naturally strong and violent, were unduly excited by disappointed ambition. According to his own account, Mr. Mather was able to write in seven languages. It seems that he had given some attention to the Massachusetts Indian language as early as 1688.<sup>3</sup> "Dr. Trumbull," continues Mr. Pilling, "in 'The Memorial History of Boston,' criticizes Mather's knowledge of the language."

"The devils," he says, "who found Mather's Indian too hard for them were not without excuse. Judging from the specimens he printed, he had not mastered the rudiments of the grammar, and could not construct an Indian sentence idiomatically. It is not certain how much of these translations were his own work, and how much was obtained from incompetent interpreters."

Dr. Trumbull is, in all that relates to Indian bibliography, to the construction and relationship of American Indian languages, admitted to be one of the greatest authorities. To what extent his remarks may apply to less distinguished New England writers is a question for serious consideration. One can imagine the dismay

<sup>1</sup> The printing plant of Green & Johnson was moved from Cambridge to Boston prior to 1700.

<sup>2</sup> The copy of this work in the Lenox Library cost \$300 in 1890.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 314-5.

<sup>4</sup> The Pagan Indians.

of the good Indians as well as that of "the devils" in making sense out of defective Indian text.

A very queer little work published in the Indian language was translated: "The Hatchets to Hew Down the Tree of Sin, which Bears the Fruit of Death," etc. Boston, 1705, 8°, pp. 16.

The author of this work is unknown.

"Of this tract," writes Dr. Trumbull, "I have seen only two copies, one in the Antiquarian Society Library; the other is now in the Lenox Library, New York."<sup>1</sup>

As an example of the glowing accounts of America offered to the consideration of the people of England, towards the close of the seventeenth century, may be cited from p. 486 of the work under review:

"Gabriel Thomas:<sup>2</sup> An Historical and Geographical Account of the province and country of Pennsylvania; and of West New Jersey in America, the Sweetness of the situation, the Richness of the Soil, the Wholesomness of the Air, the Navigable Rivers, and others, the prodigious Encrease of Corn, the flourishing Condition of the City of Philadelphia, with the stately Buildings, and other Improvements there. The Strange Creatures, as Birds, Beasts, Fishes, and Fowls, with the several sorts of Minerals, Purging Waters, and Stones, lately discovered. The Natives, Aborigines (*sic*), their Language, Religion, Laws and Customs; The first Planters, the Dutch, Sweeds, and English, with the number of its Inhabitants; As also a touch upon George Keith's New Religion, in his second Change since he left the Quakers. With a map, etc." London. Printed for, and sold by A. Baldwin, at the Oxon Arms in Warwick Lane, 1698.

What gives this work a place in this bibliography is the linguistic examples of the dialects of the Delawares or the Lenâpés. Frankfort and Leipsic editions are also noted.

Between Penn and Thomas, the Quaker colony was fairly well advertised in Europe.

Robert Beverley's "History and Present state of Virginia," etc., London, 1705, treats of "the learning and language of the Indians, the Algonkine," etc.

No community of Indians in New England, probably, received more missionary care than the tribes inhabiting Martha's Vineyard. This island, with others, was granted by Lord Stirling to Thomas Mayhew in 1641, who began a settlement at Edgartown, in 1642.<sup>3</sup>

At that time there were probably, of the native population, 1500 souls. In 1720 there were but 800 of all ages on the island.

One of the most zealous of the disciples of John Eliot was the Rev. Thomas Mayhew, son of the grantee, who was the first minister of the first English church on the island.

<sup>1</sup> The *Hatchets* in the Lenox Library cost \$40.

<sup>2</sup> Gabriel Thomas had been a resident of Pennsylvania for fifteen years.

<sup>3</sup> He died on the island in 1681, aged ninety-two.

He began to preach to the Indians in 1643, and soon after converted Hiacoomes, probably a chief, who was instructed and became his assistant, and who subsequently was ordained a minister.

Rev. Thomas Mayhew translated and had printed some devotional tracts in the local dialect.

In 1657 he sailed for England with one of his Indian preachers, and was lost at sea.

The Rev. Experience Mayhew, grandson of the above, was born on the island in 1673. His father, Rev. John Mayhew, was an Indian preacher. Rev. Experience, in his own account, says: "I learnt the Indian Language by rote, as I did my mother tongue, and not by Studying the rules of it, as the Lattin (*sic*) Tongue is commonly Learned." He began to preach to the Indians in 1694.

His earliest work in the Indian dialect, described by Mr. Pilling, who gives fac-similes of the English and Indian title-pages, was "A discourse concerning the Institution and observation of the Lord's day," Boston, 1707, 16°, p. 36.<sup>1</sup> "The Massachusetts psalter; or psalms of David, with the gospel according to John." In columns of Indian and English, 16°, 201 leaves, was printed in Boston in 1709. Fac-similes of the title-pages in Indian and English are given.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Trumbull says of this work: "Mayhew's version of the Psalms and Gospel of John is founded upon Eliot's: but every verse underwent revision, and scarcely one remains without some alteration. The spelling differs considerably from that of Eliot and others, who had learned the language among the Indians of the mainland. In exploring 'the latitudes and corners' of Indian Grammar, Mr. Mayhew probably went further than Eliot had gone, and the fact that his work went through the hands of 'James,' the Indian printer, gives it additional value as a monument of the language."<sup>3</sup>

We are indebted to Mr. Pilling for some authentic information regarding the Mohegan or Stockbridge Indians. In the early part of the eighteenth century "the Mohegans, commonly called the River Indians, were the largest tribe of any near the English settlements in New England. They dwelt mostly along the eastern border of New York, partly in the northwest corner of Connecticut, and in the southwest part of Massachusetts, on Housatunuk River." In 1735 John Sergeant, who was born in Newark, New Jersey, in 1710, and who was graduated at Yale College in

<sup>1</sup> This edition was priced in London at \$250 by Quaritch.

<sup>2</sup> A copy of this work sold in New York for \$135.

<sup>3</sup> "James" was probably the first of his race who became a printer. He was a Natic Indian, and learned his trade from Samuel Green in Cambridge. "He had worked on both editions of the Indian Bible." Trumbull, quoted by Mr. Pilling, p. 348.

1729, was ordained to the ministry, and sent as a missionary to Housatunnuk, with a salary of £150. The tribe numbered only fifty families. Mr. Sergeant applied himself to the study of the dialect of the tribe, which he soon mastered. In 1736, land being granted by Massachusetts "above the mountain," a township of six miles square was laid out and called Stockbridge, and to this location the Mohegans were removed; hence, the origin of the name this tribe has since been familiarly known by, the "Stockbridge Indians." The new town became the seat of Mr. Sergeant's mission. He preached to them in their own dialect, and so well, that the Indians were wont to say: "Our minister speaks our language better than we ourselves can do." Mr. Sergeant succeeded in converting most of the tribe. He also extended his labors to other localities. In 1747 he wrote that he had gathered the scattered families around him; instead of their "Bark Hutts," they own seventeen "English Houses," fifteen of which they had built themselves at their own cost. In 1749 he contracted a malignant fever, and died at the age of thirty-nine years.

The Indian population had, in the meantime, increased to 218 persons, 182 of whom had been baptized, and his church had 42 native communicants.

Mr. Pilling has given fac-similes of two pages in Indian of "morning prayer" and "prayer before sermon," which Mr. Sergeant had composed and had printed for the use of his flock. The history of this tribe subsequently may be briefly stated. For two years they were without a pastor; several succeeded until 1775, when John Sergeant, son of the first missionary, became the successor in his father's work, and was an adept in the use of the native dialect. He so continued until 1785, when the whole tribe removed to land which the Oneida nation in New York had given them, where they built the village of New Stockbridge. Mr. Sergeant subsequently followed and resumed his pastorate, which lasted thirty-eight years. The church was built by the Missionary Society, and would accommodate 500 persons. The mission was supported by the Scotch Society propaganda in Scotland, by Harvard College, and by the American Indian Missionary Society jointly.

In 1795 "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism" was published in the Mohegan dialect.

The lands of the Oneida Indians had been rapidly passing from their control, and in 1818 one portion of the New Stockbridge people removed to Indiana, and in 1822 another large party joined the principal portion of the Oneida nation, who that year emigrated to Wisconsin and occupied a reservation of about 70,000 acres on Fox River, near Green Bay."

"The Indiane Primer or the first Book. By which children may know truly to read the Indian Language, and milk for Babes. Boston: Printed by B. Green, 1720;" is the literal translation of a work in Indian and English, 12mo., pp. 168, and was probably prepared for the press by Experience Mayhew, the name of the author not appearing.

Fac-similes of the title pages and of pages 19—19 in Indian on one and English on the other, are given.

An edition of the same work of about ten years later date with fac-simile follows. The contents are curious as they appear in English.<sup>1</sup>

"The history of the colony of Nova Cassaria or New Jersey, by Samuel Smith," Burlington in New Jersey, 1765. 8vo., pp. 573, is noted as containing examples of the New Jersey Indians.<sup>2</sup>

The travels of Captain Jonathan Carver, 1766—1768, through the interior parts of North America, London, 1778, pp. 544, 8vo.; an edition of 1779 and another of 1781, are noted.

There is also an edition of the same work printed in Dublin, 1779; two Paris editions in 1784; a Philadelphia edition of 1784, and another of 1789; a Portsmouth, New Hampshire, edition of 1794; a Dutch edition printed at Leyden in 1796; another Philadelphia edition of 1796; and a Boston edition of 1797. Nineteenth century editions follow. Next to the Baron La Hontan's, Captain Carver's descriptive account of this country seems to have had the largest number of editions of any similar work during the same century. Besides those noted above, there are others. It has a place in the Algonquian bibliography on account of the description given of the Indian nations whom Carver states he had visited. The dissertations of Rev. Jonathan Edwards on the languages of the Muhhekanew and of the Mohegan and other Indian nations, printed in a series of tracts, the first of which appeared at New Haven, Connecticut, 1788, and which were reprinted in London—are described by Mr. Pilling.

A work similar to that of Captain Carver, is, "Voyages and travels of an Indian interpreter and trader describing the manners and customs of the North American Indians," etc.; examples of Chippewa, Iroquois, Mohegan, Shawnee and Esquimeaux dialects, etc.; by John Long. London, 1791, pp. 295. Quarto. Very little dependence can be placed on the linguistic parts of travellers' narratives, such as have been described.

John Quinney, an educated Mohegan and who was an assistant

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the latter edition in the original leather binding and clean, is in the Lenox Library. It cost \$230.

<sup>2</sup> A copy of this edition was sold in New York for \$125. The prices paid for the respective works as stated, are according to Mr. Pilling.

of Rev. John Sergeant, the elder, at the Stockbridge mission, translated and had printed at Stockbridge, "The Assembly's Catechism," 1795—fac-similes of the title page and of the first page are given; subsequently he translated and published "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism," both in the Mohegan dialect.

Benjamin Smith Barton, M.D., is also noted in reference to his dissertations on the Indian languages, Philadelphia, 1797.

The eighteenth century closes with a notice of "Essay of a Delaware, Indian and English spelling book, for the use of the schools of the Christian Indians on Muskingum River. By David Zeisberger, missionary among the Western Indians. Philadelphia, printed by Henry Miller, 1776," pp. 113; 16mo., with a fac-simile of the title page.

Mr. Pilling devotes five closely printed octavo pages to Zeisberger's religious books, printed in the Delaware language, the later editions extending from 1803 to 1847. Rev. Mr. Zeisberger was one of the most devoted Moravian missionaries of the eighteenth century. He was born in Moravia in 1721, and died at Goshen, Ohio, in 1808. He was sent to America in 1740 by the Moravian Church, and was attached in a subordinate capacity to the Creek mission in Georgia. Thence he was sent to Pennsylvania and became a student of the Moravian Indian School at Bethlehem, where he was instructed in the Delaware and Iroquoian languages. He was ordained and appointed to the missionary service in 1743. He had then acquired a knowledge of the languages of prominent Indian nations. His work was widely extended and his converted tribes were generally known as the Moravian Indians.

The principal scenes of his labors were on the Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan frontiers, latterly in Western Canada, from whence he retired with his converts to Goshen, Ohio, in 1798, where, as stated, he died.

His many adventures and escapes from death on the frontiers form a marvelous history and his memory is respected wherever known in the Western States.

Mr. Pilling, in his exhaustive "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages," has been quite liberal in his notes of the works of the New England missionaries from John Eliot, to what may be called the second generation of these missionaries, who succeeded to Mr. Eliot's work. These notes cover 182 closely printed octavo columns, or 91 pages; while 67 fac-similes illustrate the printed matter, making in the aggregate about 160 pages and leaves, while the last page of the text is 575, covering a period extending from 1609 to 1891, or 282 years of Algonquian history, with which this bibliography connects.

Writers in sympathy with the people of the Iroquoian Confed-

eracy, of whom Lewis Henry Morgan of Rochester, New York, was conspicuous, admit that the most interesting period in the history of the five Nations of the League, was the fifty years or more, comprising the respective missions of the seventeenth century; while the Christianizing results of these missions on the laws and customs of the Iroquoian people were never eradicated.

The New England missions were, as stated, contemporary with the Huronia and Iroquoian missions, although the perils and loss of life attending the latter, were such as were never endured in the former.

The general reader should remember that the Puritan ministers whose names appear in connection with missionary work in New England, however distinguished some of those may have been, were comparatively few in proportion to all the Puritan ministry at a corresponding time; there is good reason to believe that neither the New England people or their ministers, had much sympathy with the work of John Eliot or of his successors. It is apparent however, that this period in the history of the unfortunate New England Indian Nations, was the most interesting since the advent of the white men upon their soil.

We have endeavored in the brief space permitted us, to place before the reader a fair illustration of the outlines of the work accomplished by the Puritan missionaries, as it is our intention to inquire why the work of such good men has produced such barren results; although it is beyond contradiction that the Indians of New England were susceptible of Christian influence and readily accepted the rigid code their teachers prescribed for them.

During the first half of the seventeenth century, as we have stated, five sachems governed all the Indian nations within the present boundaries of New England. They numbered thirty-two and comprised the Accominta, Agawome, portions of Long Island, Massachusetts, Mohegan, Montauk, Munsee, Naamkeep, Narragansett, Nashaway, Natic, Naugatuck, Nehethway, Neponset, Niantic, Nipmuck, Nonantum, Norridgewock, Panpticough, Pamunkey, Paskatawayo, Pawkunnawkut, Pawtucket, Pennakook, Pequot, Plymouth (so called), Pokanoket, Punkapaog, Unquachog, Wampanoag, Wapanoc and Weechagaska.<sup>1</sup>

The languages and dialects of nearly all these nations are noted in the Algonquian bibliography, so that there is nothing shadowy about the fact of their having had an existence on New England soil; while most of the people of these nations probably had been more or less influenced by missionary teaching, and many communities among them had been admitted into the Puritan fold,

<sup>1</sup> The nomenclature of these Indian nations is given according to James Constantine Pilling.



having distinct organizations, and, in many cases, these Indian flocks had for their shepherds ministers or teachers of their own nation or race.

What has become of these thirty-six nations of American Indians whom the Puritans found living upon the soil when they made their first settlements in New England?

What has become of the Christian Indian communities which the Puritan missionaries had converted during the seventeenth and part of the eighteenth centuries?

These are serious questions; but, unfortunately, there is but one answer to them.

With the exception of the Mohegan tribes at Stockbridge, who removed to Oneida county, New York, in 1784—and, perhaps, there may be other unimportant exceptions—these nations have become extinct.

Their descendents are not to be found among the people of the expatriated nations west of the Mississippi nor anywhere else in the western country nor anywhere, in fact, on American soil.

If, by chance, there exists a small number claiming descent from any of these nations, they are no longer American Indians; a few drops of aboriginal blood is all that remains; the rest comes from negro slaves or degraded whites; the color of the Indian has disappeared and they have long since forgotten the use or meaning of an Indian dialect.

It is a singular fact that among of the few copies extant of the Bible, hymn-books, catechisms, prayer-books and homilies, which were printed in the languages of the New England Indians and circulated among them during the fifty years comprising the Puritan missionary period of the seventeenth century, not a single copy can be found in the possession of a descendent of the Indians among whom they were distributed during the period mentioned.

The years of toil, of patient, monotonous labor, necessarily given by John Eliot for the translation and production of his Indian Bibles, proves for all time his philanthropic zeal for the welfare of his Indian contemporaries; and each one of his Bibles existing at the present day, treasured so highly as they are, is, in fact, a monumental memorial of his good work in the Indians' behalf.

But it is sad to reflect upon the fact that no other result remains from the creation and distribution of Mr. Eliot's Bibles than to illustrate the gigantic failure of the Puritan missions and to point to the crime of the destruction of the Indian race of New England.

About the time that Mr. Eliot founded Natic the destruction of the fabric of Christianity, which had been reared in Huronia by Catholic missionaries, had become complete. The Iroquoians in-

vaded the Huron cantons in force and the autonomy of the Huron nation was literally wiped out of existence and its tribes carried captives to the Iroquoian cantons, where they were divided among the eight tribes of the league and adopted into the commonwealth; while others fled to the islands and shores of Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan. Such of the missionaries as escaped in the general slaughter made their way to Quebec, bringing with them about sixty Huron families, the *élite* of their converts.

To provide a home for these Huron Christian exiles the Indian town of Lorette was founded near Quebec. This was at a corresponding period with the settlement of the Indian town of Natic, as stated, in Massachusetts, or about two hundred and fifty years ago.

We have seen how the Indian converts at Natic suffered from Puritan anger during the excitement of the Indian wars. Mr. Eliot, aided by General Gookin, removed them, and after the excitement had subsided brought them back; and subsequently the town became extinct. How about the Huron town of Lorette?

It still remains where it was founded, with its mission church and school. Its population, who are lineal descendants of the exiles from Huronia, numbered 301 souls, but 5 of whom were non-Catholics, in 1892.

During the bright and the dark periods of missionary work by the Jesuit fathers in the Iroquoian cantons at, as stated, a corresponding period with the Puritan missions in New England, it became necessary, from time to time, to protect Christian converts from the malevolence of pagan relatives and from persecutions, which made their lives unsafe and their existence unhappy.

A retreat for Iroquoian Christians was, through providential intervention, provided at Laprarie, on the river St. Lawrence, near Montreal. This retreat has since been generally known as Caughnawaga, and during the seventeenth century it became the refuge of such of the converts as could no longer live in their homes in the romantic regions of the "country of the lakes" of New York, and who, abandoning these sylvan abodes, with all their traditional memories and the last resting places of their kindred generations, came to the Christian Iroquoian town of Laprarie.

Another retreat was founded later on on the St. Lawrence, to which Christian Iroquoian converts came, even in greater numbers than to Caughnawaga. This retreat has since been known as the mission of St. Régis. But while there came to Caughnawaga exiles from all the five nations, those who settled at St. Régis must have been principally Mohawk converts, for the St. Régis Indians of the present day are recognized by the Iroquoian nations as Mohawks, and as such have been admitted into the Iroquoian

confederacy, which has a nominal existence as such only, as a Mohawk nation in place of the seceded tribes of this nation who, for a century or more, have made their homes on the shores of the Grand River valley in the Dominion of Canada.

Let us see if these tribes of this once warlike league of New York, who were won from barbarism by the Jesuits and made Christians during the seventeenth century, have been wiped out of existence, as were the tribes of the New England nations.

The figures I am about to quote are taken from "The Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs" for the year ending December 31, 1892, for the Dominion of Canada. Ottawa, 1893. Octavo, pp. 402, with tables.

According to the reports of the agents of the government, the number of Catholic Iroquoians living on Canadian soil, as shown in detail, was:

At Caughnawaga, . . . . .	1770
At the Lake of the Two Mountains, . . . . .	225
On the Canadian side of St. Régis, . . . . .	1200
<hr/>	
Total, . . . . .	3195
If we add the Mohawks living across the Canadian line in the	
State of New York, of the St. Régis mission, . . . . .	1030
<hr/>	
We have a total of . . . . .	4225

All of these are Catholics, except, perhaps, a score of unbelievers living on the American side in the St. Régis mission.

Those only who are familiar with the history of the missions in the Iroquoian cantons can appreciate the labors of the scholarly and saintly men who imperilled their lives and endured great privation to win from barbarism the ancestors of these 4225 survivors, who had expatriated themselves to preserve the gift of faith they had acquired at the hands of these venerable missionaries. But who among the descendants of the Puritans will explain why the results of these missions have been so fruitful, while those of the Puritan missions have been so hopelessly barren? More than \$10,000, a large sum in those days, was sent out by the London propaganda to print Bibles, hymn books and homilies in the language of the New England Indians, and from their liberal distribution great results were expected.

Every one in New England, from the cobbler to the Governor, could read his Bible, and even dispute about the meaning of some of the doubtful passages in the sacred text. But alas! how few of the Indians whom it was sought to convert were capable of reading an Indian Bible, much less understanding the prolific significations of its text!

While a New England Indian was given such a difficult mental problem, the Jesuit missionary gave his Iroquoian catechumen the rosary beads or a blessed medal and bade him recite the simple prayers, morning and evening, in honor of the Redeemer and His Mother. What nature so dull as not to understand the practical methods of such simple devotion. Fancy the reflections of the warrior as he told the beads of each decade with his dusky-hued fingers, or of the squaw as she gazed upon the face of the Mother of Sorrows on her blessed medal. Which method was most likely to make a Christian out of an uncultivated savage?

But we might go further in our inquiries and ask the descendants of the Puritans to explain how it has come about, that of the 32 Indian nations who once owned the soil of New England, not one remains; while of the 5 nations who occupied the soil of New York at a similar early day, one only, the Cayugas, has been disintegrated, while the others retain their autonomy and continue to increase? <sup>1</sup>

There are some Indian nations in Maine whose names are not included among the 32 referred to above; take, for instance, the Abenaki and the Algonquin.

The former nation and the latter were served by Jesuit missionaries from an early period, to the conquest of Canada, while living on New England soil. One of the later Abenaki missionaries was Sebastian Rasle, S. J., who was brutally butchered by English soldiers at the foot of the mission cross at Norridgewock in 1724, and his body, after being mutilated by the "incensed soldiery," was left unburied. The origin of the Abenaki missions is very remote: for 250 years the people of this nation have been attended by Catholic missionaries. There were living at St. Francis and Becancour, in the Province of Quebec, 450 Abenakis in 1892, but of this number 69 at St. Francis were non-Catholics.

There are more than 2000 Algonquins in the Province of Quebec, nearly all of whom are Catholic. There are 1300 Montagnais Indians in the Saguenay and Lake St. John districts and nearly 400 of other nations may be found in the same Canadian Province. Out of the 1300 Montagnais, 71 only at St. John are reported to be non-Catholic.

The people of these nations were first converted by Catholic missionaries during the later half of the seventeenth century.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas and Oneidas. The Tuscaroras were added to the league of the five nations in 1712. This nation also survives. There are about 5000 of the descendants of these nations at present in the State of New York. About 4000 are non-Catholics, half of whom are Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists, and the other half follow the Iroquoian cult. As stated, 1000 Mohawks at St. Regis are solidly Catholic.

They not only survive but also increase slowly, and they offer a remarkable example of the steadfastness which has characterized their adherence to the faith their forefathers were so fortunate as to acquire.

But probably the most interesting example which can be offered of the faithful adhesion of the people of any one American Indian nation to the Catholic faith is that of the Micmac.

In the Province of Nova Scotia there are 17 government Indian agencies having 2151 Micmac Indians; in fact, there is no other nation in the province but the Micmac, and they are solidly Catholic. In the Province of New Brunswick there are 11 government Indian agencies having 1511 Micmacs with some Amalicates, all solidly Catholic.

In the Province of Prince Edward Island, there are 312 Micmacs, all united in the Catholic faith.

The French Jesuits sought the conversion of the people of this nation as early as 1610. Fathers Enemond Masse and Peter Biard were the apostles, but they did not succeed in landing at Port Royal until 1611. Here we find a nation of Indians, numbering nearly 4000 souls, whose present condition we shall refer to later, who first beheld a Catholic missionary two hundred and eighty-three years ago. We have taken the figures given from the Dominion report mentioned, which shows that in the aggregate of souls given there is not a solitary non-Catholic.

Charles Sargeant, Northeastern Superintendent, Chatham Head, N. B., in his report dated October 14, 1892, speaking of the respective reserves, describes the Eel Ground, Northumberland County: "This is a fine reserve, sloping nicely to the river, and well adapted for farming, yielding fine crops, etc. Their houses are fairly comfortable; they have a neat church and school-house, and the Indians are fairly well to do."

At Burnt Church, in the same county, Mr. Sargeant reports: "This band, on account of location, should be very well off; they can fish nearly all the year round. In the summer season they can catch salmon, bass, mackerel, herring, and codfish, and in the winter they fish for smelt, all of which has a market as soon as caught."

"The land is fairly good, and they raise more or less potatoes, oats, corn, etc.

"There is a fine old church on the reserve, and a neat school-house, with a young lady as teacher."

"The population is about 200. They always celebrate the festival of St. Anne (July 26th) in July, during which time (the octave) all work is ignored."

The report from Big Cove, in Kent County, reads: "This is a

very fine reserve, and, as a rule, the Indians are better individuals than in many other places. The soil is good, and when an effort is made, they raise good crops. A number of them work on the river, running lumber from the mills to the place of shipping. This reserve has the largest population in my superintendency. There is a very nice church here, and I am pleased to know they are anxious to keep it in good order and repair," etc.

James Farrell, agent for the Northern Division, Fredericton, remarks: "In closing, I am pleased to report that the habits and customs of each band are exceptionally good.

"A few occasionally indulge in the use of intoxicants, but, as a rule, seven-eighths of all the Indians are an industrious and thrifty class of people."

In Nova Scotia, Charles E. Beckwith, Indian Agent at Kentville, reports, August 15, 1892: "There is not much change in the Indians of this agency; the greater part of them are hard-working, quiet, and industrious people," etc.

Thomas J. Butler, Indian Agent at Caledonia, Queens County, in the same Province, reports, August 15, 1892: "The majority of the Indians reside at Milton. Those there live in comfortable houses, are clean and tidy in their habits, and obey the sanitary regulations of the department. Very many of them delight in cultivating flower gardens, besides attending to the cultivation of the seed received from the government. Some of them have this year cleared more land in order to put in a larger crop next spring. I am happy to state that I have not heard of one case of drunkenness amongst them during the past year.

"The one or two who, in the past, were addicted to this vice are now reformed men. Those living at Milton, on account of its proximity to Liverpool, a seaport town, are in more danger of temptation than elsewhere, yet they are all sober people. I am glad of this, knowing the sober, industrious Indian makes as good a citizen as his white neighbor."

"The majority of the Indians in Lunenburg County (N. S.) reside on the grant at New Germany, and have splendid soil, fine farms, good houses, large stock, and are a happy and contented people. There is no laziness there; no poverty, no begging. They are as good as their white neighbors, as independent, and as much respected," etc.

Robert McDonald, Indian Agent at Pictou, N. S., reports, September 1, 1892, of the people in his district: "Sobriety is fast becoming a virtue with them. They seem to realize every day the injury and danger of the habit of drinking."

The whole tribe this year, as usual, gathered at the Indian Island to celebrate the festival of St. Anne, their patron saint.

They have shown a great deal of sincere piety. It is their great desire to have their beautiful little church entirely finished.

They have already spent on it, and the house for the priest, in the vicinity of \$2000, the most of which was paid by themselves.

The benefit of gathering to this island once every year is not to be viewed alone from a religious standpoint. The priest or agent can confer with them as a body on matters concerning their temporal welfare, and impress upon them the advantage of adopting the new and improved methods in their various avocations," etc.

Father John C. Chisholm, Indian Agent at St. Peter's, Cape Breton, reports: "I am glad to say that the Indians under my charge are, as a rule, sober, religious, and law abiding."

John O. Arsenault, Indian Agent at Egmont Bay, Prince Edward Island, reports, August 22, 1892: "There appears to be a certain emulation among them in improving their condition; they have made considerable progress during the last fifteen years," etc.<sup>1</sup>

Such, generally speaking, was the social, religious, and temporal condition of the tribes composing the 4000 souls known as the Micmac Indians, who, nearly three centuries ago, were converted to Christianity by Catholic missionaries, and who have since resided in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island.

The Indians are prone to councils, and have been so for all time. The assembling of these Micmacs every year during the last week in July, during the octave of the festival of St. Anne, as mentioned, bears much resemblance to an annual tribal council. To the Indians, St. Anne's festival is one of the most important solemnities in their year's life; with them, it is even more honored than by Catholics, perhaps, in the Province of Quebec; and the custom originated in the earliest days of Christianity among them.

Fair-minded Americans, who have been disposed to aid the continuous efforts made in Congress to cripple the missionary schools among the American Indians west of the Mississippi, by cutting off the annual appropriations made for their partial support, might perhaps change their opinions after a careful study of the annual reports of the Indian Department of the Dominion of Canada.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Annual Report* of the Department of Indian Affairs of the Dominion of Canada, for 1892, pp. 34, 37, 40, 42, and 45.

The large number of Catholic mission schools maintained, the reports of the status of these schools, the improved condition of the resident and even the nomadic tribes, will surprise many.

It concerns the taxpayers of this country also to study the problem of the disparity of the cost to each government for the care of its Indian population. It has been stated that \$160 per capita per annum is the cost to the United States Government, while it costs the Government of the Dominion of Canada only \$35.

The printed works noted in the "Algonquian Bibliography," by Mr. Pilling, in their chronological order, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, having been considered, the works in manuscript during the same period, which may be found to be of more interest, will be considered in another article.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

---



## INDIFFERENTISM.

"There is a master of scoffing that in his catalogue of books of a feigned library sets down this title of a book, *The Morris-Dance of Hereticks*. For indeed every sect of them hath a diverse posture or cringe which cannot but move derision in worldlings and depraved politickes."—BACON, *Essay on Unity of Religion*.

PROTESTANT England was once on fire with the spirit of religion. It was a spirit of bigotry, yet zealous and earnest. It was a spirit of persecution, yet founded on deep, though false, conviction. It was a spirit that brooked no opposition, domineering and intolerant; that upturned the altars at which long generations had worshipped; that tore down the figure of Christ the Crucified and trampled it under foot; that broke in pieces the images of saints in painted glass and graven metal and carved stone; that drove into exile or racked and tortured unto death priests and people of the ancient faith.

Protestant England was no doubt deeply in error, but it was also beyond all mistake deeply in earnest. The error remains, but the earnestness, where is it? It has long since departed. That fiery fanaticism is now burnt out, and what is there but empty niche and desecrated tomb and pillaged shrine amid ruins of chapel and abbey and cathedral to remind us that it once blazed so fiercely? Quenched indeed is that ardent spirit of Puritanism, but from the dead embers there has sprung up a new spirit; a spirit of live and let live; a spirit of tolerance; a spirit of indifference; a spirit that is tolerant precisely because it is indifferent. From these dead ashes of profound Puritanism there has started into life a new spirit of shallow philosophism that is filling men's hearts, not with deeper respect for religion, but with a complacent patronage of Almighty God.<sup>1</sup> Persecuting Protestantism maintained that worship of God

<sup>1</sup> Compare the following eloquent passage from Ruskin:

"The form which the infidelity of England, especially, has taken, is one hitherto unheard of in human history. No nation ever before declared boldly, by print and word of mouth, that its religion was good for show, but 'would not work.' Over and over again it has happened that nations have denied their gods, but they denied them bravely. The Greeks in their decline jested at their religion, and frittered it away in flatteries and fine arts; the French refused theirs fiercely, tore down their altars and broke their carven images. The question about God with both these nations was still, even in their decline, fairly put, though falsely answered. 'Either there is or there is not a Supreme Ruler; we consider of it, declare there is not, and proceed accordingly.' But we English have put the matter in an entirely new light: 'There is a Supreme Ruler, no question of it, only He cannot rule. His orders won't work. He will be quite satisfied by euphonious and respectful repetition of them. Execution

should take but one form, the form of psalm-singing, image-breaking Puritanism ; and it strove to force the consciences of its opponents by the rack, and the thumbscrew, and the block, and the gibbet. Nowadays, however, the pulse of Protestantism throbs no longer with this fiery excitement of Puritanical zeal. Its pulse has grown sluggish with the torpor of indifferentism. The cold has reached its heart. Protestantism, as that creed at its birth was understood, is well-nigh dead ; dead and buried, it might be said, were it not for a sprinkling of honest folk in out-of-the-way places who cling to old-fashioned prejudices and lag far in rear of the logical and intellectual developments of their age. It is a matter which Catholics may be thankful for that Protestantism is very tolerant now. It persecutes no more. It no longer puts pressure on any man's conscience. And why not? Because it holds that one religion is just as good as another. It is, as we say, indifferentist.

Now, indifferentism is not the same thing as atheism, though it leads to it, as will presently be shown. Nay, modern enlightenment in the present stage of its development is not only willing to allow that God exists ; it will even grant that He should be adored, with, however, this important qualification, that whether the divine worship is to take this form or that is a matter solely for the worshipper himself to decide. Advanced thinking treats God as a distant acquaintance towards whom a faint show of civility is enough. It considers that God ought to be, and indeed must be, very well satisfied to be adored at all, without imposing on the worshipper the particular form of religion in which that adoration shall be clothed. That jack-o-lantern called the *zeitgeist*, or spirit of the age, holds definite and dogmatic teaching to be antiquated and out of date ; a mere fossil, a piece of ancient history, the relic of a dead past, the shreds and tatters of a worn-out mediævalism, the last rusty link of the chains of a slavish age, a remnant of the barbarism of the Dark Ages impotently struggling for existence in the intellectual refulgence of our enlightened epoch.

---

would be too dangerous under existing circumstances, which He certainly never contemplated.'

"I had no conception of the absolute darkness which has covered the human mind in this respect, until I began to come into collision with persons engaged in the study of economical and political questions. The entire *naïveté* and undisturbed imbecility with which I found them declare that the laws of the devil were the only practicable ones, and that the laws of God were merely a form of poetical language, passed all I had ever before read of moral infidelity. I knew the fool had often said in his heart there was *no* God ; but to hear himself say clearly out with his lips, 'There is a foolish God,' was something which my art studies had not prepared me for. The French had indeed, for a considerable time, hinted much of the meaning in the delicate and compassionate blasphemy of their phrase '*le bon Dieu*,' but had never ventured to put it into more precise terms."—*Modern Painters*, v., p. ix., c. 12.

Consequently, the English nation is now opposed to set formularies and dogmatic decrees and well-defined doctrines of faith. For if any one religion is as good as any other, it is but common sense to choose that creed which trammels a man least. Why be a Catholic with the obligations to attend Mass every Sunday, to abstain, to fast, to confess sins to a priest, if it is as easy to travel to heaven without these burdens as with them? Current thought looks on religion as a question of æsthetics; a matter of feeling or of taste or of sentiment. Englishmen assert their liberty to choose their creed as they choose their clothes, and claim the right to change their faith just as freely as they change their fashions. They demand leave for a man to form his views in religion as he forms them in painting or in poetry or in architecture; to form them, that is, without let or hindrance from man or God according to the individual's taste and fancy and character and inclination; and whatever view the individual thinks fit to adopt, with that Almighty God must be satisfied. And thus the modern tolerantist makes broad his phylacteries and enlarges the borders of his garments and gives thanks that he is not wedded to a fixed creed, a believer in dogma, an infallibilist, priest-ridden, narrow-minded, even as is the Catholic. This is the large and liberal religion of the day—a comprehensive cult which encourages you to hold any view and to entertain any opinion provided only you do not condemn the opposite of that view or the contradictory of that opinion. Do not be so intolerant as to think your neighbor in the wrong because he holds your coal-black to be snow-white. For this is to be broad-minded. This is to be indifferentist.<sup>1</sup>

The spirit of the age is a spirit of lawless liberalism in religion. The fashionable principle is this: Be respectable in your outward life; sin not against the easy code of social morality, or at least do not flaunt your sin in the public eye; do not shock your neighbor's sense of propriety and decorum; and then it matters little or nothing what your faith may be. The popular theory amounts to this, that if a man is upright in his dealings; if he is known for a faithful husband, a good father, a just master, a loyal citizen, it is unimportant to what creed he holds. Be he Catholic or Baptist, or Quaker, or Unitarian, call himself by the name of any one of the myriad sects that spring up, mushroom-like, around us, his salvation is in every case secure because all these religions are equally pleasing to God; each is a fair and flowery path leading straight and comfortably and pleasantly to heaven.

---

<sup>1</sup> Indifferentism, or, as it is sometimes called, latitudinarianism, or tolerantism, is used in a variety of senses. Civil and political indifferentism is that which tolerates different religions in the same state. Religious and theological, which teaches that all religions are equally conducive to salvation.

Now, strange as this theory seems to us Catholics, with our religion sharply defined, clear cut, unchanged and unchangeable, it is nevertheless a quite logical deduction; it is the only issue and outcome of Protestantism. Protestantism leads straight into indifferentism, and, in the end, it leads to rationalism,<sup>1</sup> on the road to which indifferentism is but the half way house.<sup>2</sup> It may be convenient to point out that by the term "Protestant" is here meant that generic religion which comprises not only the four great branches of specific Protestantism—Lutheran, Arminian, Calvinist, and Socinian—but also all those other sects or offshoots which Anglicans sum up under the general name "Dissent."<sup>3</sup> By "Protestantism" we mean that negation of Catholicity which began its career by revolt against the infallible guidance and authority of the Church Catholic, which taught that there was but one objective rule of faith, the Scriptures, to be interpreted by the private judgment of the individual according to the light of his own unaided reason.<sup>4</sup> Of that religion private judgment is the keystone, and because such is the case, indifferentism first and rationalism afterwards must, both in theory and in practice, flow from it. This is the contention admirably developed by De Lamennais in his profound and eloquent, though, in parts, mistaken, "*Essai sur l'Indifférence*."<sup>5</sup> This, too, is the contention which Father Perrone worked out in his "*Prelectiones Theologicae*,"<sup>6</sup> where he shows that Protestantism, in its *critical* capacity, by tampering with the canon of Scripture; in its *exegetical* capacity by interpreting Scripture according to the ever-changing light of private judgment; and in its *dogmatical* capacity by the introduction of those heretical tenets which follow from its first principles could only lead *de jure* and has led *de facto* into the grossest rationalism.

<sup>1</sup> The Protestant writer, Amand Saintes, in his *Histoire critique du rationalisme en Allemagne*, p. 7, writes: "Quoq qu'il soit vrai de dire. que les principes du rationalisme se confondent avec ceux du Protestantisme ou, du moins, qu'ils en découlent, et que l'établissement de la réformation devart amener inévitablement le rationalisme," etc.

<sup>2</sup> Leo XII., Encyc. *Ubi primum*, said: "Indifferentism not only boldly maintains that all the sects are on the right road (recte ambulare), but also those societies which profess pure deism and even pure materialism.

<sup>3</sup> The name "Dissent" is not very expressive. The offshoots of Anglicanism, etc., "dissent" from what? Not from that against which the mother-heresy "protested," viz., Catholicity; since the children are more bitter than the mother against the Catholic Church.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*, part i., c. 6, n. 56. "By the religion of Protestants I understand . . . that wherein they all agree and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the BIBLE. The BIBLE, I say, and the BIBLE only, is the religion of Protestants."

<sup>5</sup> Vol. i., cc. 6 and 7.

<sup>6</sup> Tom. Post., *De Locis Theologicis*, col. 1414.

Protestantism is the parent of indifferentism. For without an infallible rule of faith there is no one to settle dogmatic controversies, there is no standard by which to decide that one form of belief is better or worse than another. It is worth while to emphasize the fact that indifferentism springs from Protestantism, as the oak from the acorn, and the bird from the egg. For all current controversy really hinges on the question of infallibility; and in demonstrating the existence of infallibility it is often useful to use the negative as well as the positive form of argument; that is, not only to prove that the Church of Christ is infallible, but also to prove that without infallibility there cannot be a Church of Christ. Infallibility is the great bulwark against indifferentism. Now Protestantism possesses no infallible voice, for infallibility implies an external authority and the Protestant principle of private judgment denies, in theory, all external authority. We say "in theory," because in practice the rank and file of Protestants adopt, and of necessity adopt, since they have not the means to judge for themselves, the particular views entertained at the moment by the minister under whom they happen to sit. Their pope is their parson.<sup>1</sup> But in theory the upholders of private judgment maintain that for authority to determine for the individual what to believe is simply tyranny. The duty, let it be said in passing, of one who is searching for the true religion is to use his private judgment to discover, not the body of doctrine which he must believe, for that is beyond his power, but the authority which will teach him what these doctrines are. This principle of private judgment, we have been assured by Prof. Blackie,<sup>2</sup> has saved the world from "the despotic and soul-stupefying sacerdotalism of the Romanists." In "protesting" against the authority of the Catholic Church, the reformers denied, and meant to deny, all external authority whatever in matters of faith. The chief indictment which Protestantism is ever urging against the Church is this: that she arrogantly claims an authority which Christ never instituted—the authority to decide in questions of faith.

External authority, therefore, and private judgment are contradictory terms; they are mutually exclusive. The very *raison d'être* of Protestantism is its denial of external authority. Prove that there exists an external authority in matters religious, and thereby you prove the falsity of Protestantism.

Yet without external authority there cannot be, in the present order of God's providence, any objective and trustworthy rule of faith; and without such a rule there can be no stability; there can be nothing to stamp one religion as better than another; there can

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "Edm. Burke's Letter to His Son," *Orthodox Journal*, vol. iv., n. 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Natural History of Atheism*, p. 184.

be nothing to save the world from indifferentism. For if in the voyage of life, beset with shoals and quicksands, the mariner has to sail over unknown seas in the dark, "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine,"<sup>1</sup> without pilot, without chart, without buoys to mark the banks and channels, what wonder if he comes to regard one course as good as another, and to look on it as immaterial how he sets his rudder?

The Bible alone can never be an infallible rule of faith. For infallibility is a gift of God, and God never meant the Bible, apart from an authority external to the Bible, to be any man's guide in religious matters. Had it been so intended, the Bible would have been penned by Christ, and would have existed from the beginning of His Church. Yet for nearly a hundred years Christianity subsisted without the Bible such as we have it; and necessarily so, since the revelation contained in the Bible, according to the Bible itself, was in large measure made in the first instance orally, and was orally published long before it was committed to writing. For nearly a century, therefore, was the Christian Church with or without a rule of faith? Not without, as any Protestant will allow. Then, with a rule of faith that was not the Bible. This primitive rule of faith, then, must have been an authority prior in time, extrinsic to, the Bible. Does that authority yet exist? If not, how and when did it perish, and what is the proof that the earliest rule of faith instituted by Christ was supplanted by another?

Moreover, that authentic collection of inspired books we call "the Bible" could not exist as a collection unless there had previously existed an authority to put the collection together, and to vouch for the inspiration of everything contained in it. Once again, therefore, if there is to be a Bible at all, it is necessary to recognize an authority extrinsic to the Bible. For the Bible itself cannot testify to its own canon. The Bible, no doubt, faithfully records divine revelation. But it is only a record. It cannot guarantee the inspiration of each and all the separate books it comprises. A record is not evidence unless it is authenticated. And it cannot authenticate itself. Until, therefore, it has been proved what the authenticity and genuineness of the record is, its testimony has no *locus standi*, it cannot come into court. The word of a witness, whether book or human being, cannot be accepted as veracious testimony of that witness's veracity. What authority, therefore, extrinsic to the Bible, will a Protestant adduce to prove the certain inspiration of the Bible? This difficulty has embarrassed opponents a good deal, but they have found a loophole of escape. The French Protestant theologians, Claude and Jurieu,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ephes. 4, 14.

after much casting about, discovered that Protestants *feel* the truth of the canon, etc., of Scripture. They know truth, as Jack Falstaff knew the true prince, by instinct. "Ou sent les verités fondamentales comme ou sent la lumière quand on la voit; la chaleur quand ou est auprès du feu; le doux et l'amer quand on mange."<sup>1</sup> An original and convenient doctrine. Protestants *taste* the truth of the Bible. But this Protestant acuteness of palate does not cut away the whole difficulty. For "tastes differ," which perhaps accounts for the fact that, for example, Anglicans taste the truth of the divinity of Christ, while Unitarians do not taste it. Nay, some palates are so vitiated as not to taste Biblical truth at all. Such is the palate atheistical. What, then, is to be the authority for inspiration of Scripture? Not the "Higher Criticism," which can at most only claim to show what of Scripture is *not* inspired. Not tradition, which Protestantism maintains to have erred on many vital questions. Not the Fathers, since they establish, not the intrinsic truth of the tradition, but only what in their day the tradition was. It only remains, then, for a Protestant to fall back on his private judgment and settle his own canon of Scripture.

Consequently, the canonical Scriptures are not a rule of faith for the individual, but the individual is the rule of the canonical Scriptures. From which two obvious conclusions are deduced. First, that as the individual is subject to error, so the Protestant canon has no valid claim to be free from error. Hence the rule of faith that is to preserve from error is itself, *ex hypothesi*, probably erroneous. Secondly, that as no two Protestants, if left to their own private judgment, will agree on the same canon,<sup>2</sup> so no two Protestants will have the same rule of faith. Private judgment, therefore, is a principle, not of unity, but of discord; a centrifugal, not a centripetal, force. And as one man's private judgment is to him as good as another's, so the religion devised by the one is as good as the religion devised by another.

<sup>1</sup> *Le Vrai Système*, cited by Lamennais, *Essai*, p. 239. Truth has been defined as what a man *troweth*; but it should apparently be what a man *feeleth*!

<sup>2</sup> "Truth means that which one troweth, *i.e.*, thinketh or firmly believeth,"—*Diversions of Purley*, part ii., p. 404. This is a true etymology, and accurately explains *subjective* truth. Horne Tooke is, however, talking nonsense when he says: "There is no such thing as eternal, immutable, everlasting truth. Two persons may contradict each other and yet both speak truth; for the truth of one person may be opposite to the truth of another."—P. 404. He here confounds objective with subjective truth.

<sup>4</sup> Luther rejected the Epistle of St. James because it contradicted his doctrine of "justification by faith alone." The Anglicans retain it. Strauss questioned the authenticity of the four Gospels. Schleiermacher rejected from the canon the Epistles to Timothy. If Protestants are unanimous in rejecting several of the Deuterocanonical books, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Machabees I. and II., etc., it is only a negative unanimity arising from the fact that the great bulk of the people know nothing of these books or parts of books.

Protestantism, consequently, if it is to have a fixed, stable and certain canon, must fall back on the authority of the Church. It sets up the Bible against infallibility, and yet it can have no Bible until it has recognized infallibility. It is Protestant because it "protests" against infallibility, and yet, on Protestant principles, it cannot so protest without ceasing to be Protestant. It is the position of the wood-cutter who sits on the branch he is sawing away from the trunk.

It is plain, therefore, that the Protestant so far must make two concessions: first, he must admit, that in the first century of the Church there existed—even if it has since perished, of which there is no jot or tittle of evidence—an infallible authority external to the Bible; secondly, that without such external authority there would be no Bible. However, for argument's sake, let us overlook these initial difficulties and suppose that in some mysterious way the Protestant churches—"pillars and ground of the truth"—have been presented, say by some archangelic hand, with an authentic canon of Scripture ready-made. Even then the outlook is by no means clear. For there remains the question of the integrity of revelation. Are Protestants in possession of the *whole* of revelation? Given the canon, the Bible is no doubt a revealed record of whatever it contains; but it is nothing more. It testifies that it contains revelation, but not that it contains *all* revelation. Well, it will be said, may not this integrity be assumed? By no means. For revelation was originally, in the New Testament, given for the most part orally to begin with, and on what ground are we to base the assumption that inspiration was made coextensive with revelation, that the written word covers all the ground occupied by the revealed word? The only infallible authority for Protestants, or Protestant principles, is the Bible; and inasmuch as the Bible nowhere asserts that it contains all revelation, still it contains enough for salvation. A curious answer, truly, and yet the only answer a Protestant can make! But how is this astounding assertion to be proved? By the Bible or by an authority extrinsic to the Bible? Not certainly by the Bible, which nowhere makes any such statement. Then by an authority external to the Bible; an authority to which the Protestant is once again, by stress of argument, driven to appeal. To prove, therefore, that he has revelation enough for salvation, the Protestant must appeal to that authority, to recognize which is to cease to be Protestant!

The Bible, the sole rule of faith, though it *may* not contain all revelation, still does contain all that is necessary for salvation! An admirable subterfuge, certainly. For it can hardly be denied that whatever God revealed, He revealed for our belief. Christ said with remarkable clearness to His apostles and their succes-



sors: "Going, teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded." *All*, and "he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mt., 28 : 19, Mk., 16 : 17). As De Lamennais wrote<sup>1</sup>: "Mais voici une chose étrange : Dieu révélera aux hommes des vérités nécessaires à l'homme, et les hommes ne seront pas obligés de croire Dieu, et ils resteront maîtres de rejeter les vérités que Dieu leur révèle ! Mais, à quoi bon une révélation ? Mieux valait que Dieu gardât le silence !" In one word, the subterfuge is an insult to Almighty God.

Moreover, not only does the Bible *not* contain all revelation, and not only does the Bible *not* contain all that is necessary for salvation, but Protestants themselves, in the most practical and emphatic manner, recognize and proclaim that it does not. The private judgment of the individual measures his rule of faith and is compelled to find it wanting. He falls back on tradition. He is compelled to fall back on it. He has no choice but to go beyond and behind the Bible. The Anglican believes, against the Baptist, that infants must not be denied baptism. On what authority does he believe this? Of tradition alone. The Baptist believes, against the Quaker, that swearing under certain circumstances is lawful, though the Bible bids him "swear not at all."<sup>2</sup> What is his authority for the toleration of this practice? Tradition alone. And, to specify one more out of many instances, the sects observe the Sabbath on the first instead of the last day of the week with no authority but tradition for this serious deviation from Scriptural injunction and practice. The Protestant rule of faith, then, is not the Bible alone, but the Bible eked out by tradition. And who vouches for the truth of tradition? The Protestant must again doff his Protestantism and answer—the Church.

However, again for purposes of argument, let us make another concession to Protestantism. We supposed above a Protestant to have had the canon, in some mysterious way, settled for him, to have had it determined for him, in some manner we cannot understand, what are and what are not the inspired books which go to make up that miniature library we call "the Bible." Let us now go on to imagine that the Bible without tradition contains all that is necessary for salvation. These are large concessions to make, yet they do not advance the opponent far on his road to clearness. He remains sunk to the lips in a slough of difficulties. His rule of faith still fails him. For to have faith through the Bible alone, not only must he believe that the Scriptures are the Word, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word of God, but he must also believe, *without doubting*, all that the Scriptures contain. With infallible

<sup>1</sup> *Essai*, vol. i., c. vii..

<sup>2</sup> Mt. 5, xxxiv.

certainly not only must he believe that the Bible is an authentic record of inspiration, but also he must receive *with the highest certainty* each and all of the revealed truths contained in the Bible. Not his notions about these truths, but the truths themselves in their genuine sense he must hold to and firmly believe. This is a point that cannot be too strongly insisted on, namely, that the material object of faith—the *things* to be believed, as distinct from the *motive* for believing them—are the truths themselves, and not any one's crude and unauthorized notions of those truths. Divine faith is to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed. It is not, objectively considered, one thing for one man and another thing for another man; not one thing for one man to-day and another thing for the same man to-morrow. The truths of revelation are permanent, fixed, unalterable; the same yesterday, to-day and forever. These difficult truths, therefore, the private judgment of the Protestant must grasp in their genuine sense; and he must be infallibly certain that he has so grasped them. If he is not certain, then he has room for doubt; and where there is doubt there is no faith which by definition is "belief without doubt." Now, will any man in calm possession of his senses maintain that the private judgment of the individual can, unaided by authority, seize the genuine sense of a book such as is the Bible, written originally in foreign idioms by a variety of hands in a variety of styles, the subject-matter of which is, in parts, the most abstruse with which the human mind has to cope; a book that bristles with difficulties, as the students of the "higher criticism" are earnest to proclaim? And even if an individual, gifted with overweening confidence in his own ability, should hold that it had been given to him to master the full and genuine sense of all revelation, would he further assert that his interpretation of that sense was infallibly certain with intellectual certainty? For it is not enough to *feel* certain. Feeling is not faith. Faith is fixed, feeling is transient. A man may to-day feel certain that he is the king of spades, and yet to-morrow sink his claim to royal honors. In like manner the man who one month *feels* certain of Anglicanism may the next month be professing Methodism, and the month after be preaching Quakerism, without the object of these various subjective faiths being at all the objective truths revealed by God.

Let us emphasize this dogmatic truth that the certainty of faith is an intellectual and objective certainty. It implies a firm persuasion of the intellect grasping without doubt or fear of the opposite, and with the strongest positive adhesion, that which is objectively true, with a certainty that will enable a man to stand, in the intellectual order not like an aspen quivering in the breezes but steadfast as a tower four-square to all the blasts of heaven. For

faith, as we have said, is to believe without doubting all that God has revealed, because God is the very truth that can neither deceive nor be deceived. As, then, we are bidden to believe every iota of God's revelation under pain of eternal loss, it is obvious that God must have made that revelation easily and infallibly ascertainable in its full, clear and genuine sense by the due exercise of our natural faculties as thinking beings. By what process, then, is that full, clear and genuine sense to be for certain discovered and grasped? Only through the medium of a divinely commissioned teacher teaching under supernatural guidance—in one word, only through the infallible voice of the Catholic Church. But to that voice the Protestant turns a deaf ear. How, then, can he master with certainty the full, clear and genuine sense of Scripture? By the Bible or by the authority extrinsic to the Bible? Not by the Bible, since no book can assure its reader with infallible certainty that his interpretation of that book is infallibly certain. Besides, the Scriptures nowhere give any such assurance. On the contrary, St. Peter<sup>1</sup> points out very clearly that there are certain things in the Epistles of St. Paul "hard to be understood which the unlearned and the unstable wrest, *as they do also the other Scriptures*, to their own destruction." Once again, therefore, if the Protestant is to have the certainty of faith, he must go beyond the Bible. His rule of faith has again failed him. He must appeal to authority. Is that authority fallible or infallible? If fallible, it cannot impart certainty since it has it not. Therefore, infallible. There is no trustworthy rule of faith unless infallible.

In concluding this part of the subject—that Protestantism *theoretically* leads to indifferentism, to Deism, and to atheism—we may be allowed to compress the above arguments into a nutshell. It is the fundamental principle of Protestantism that there is no rule in religion except that of Scripture interpreted by reason. Reason, then, is above revelation. It follows, in primary sequence, from this that if Scripture is to bind it must be *clear*; otherwise private judgment would believe without knowing what it believed and without knowing what the Scriptures meant it to believe. Moreover, that would be to put Scripture above reason, which, ex hypothesi, is absurd. From this it follows in secondary sequence that where Scripture appears to teach doctrines above, though not contrary to, reason—as the Trinity, the Incarnation and, in a word, all Mysteries—reason must either reject that part of Scripture or must interpret it so that mysteries cease to be mysterious. In which case the authority of Scripture is obviously nothing more than the authority of reason itself; and as human reason varies in

---

<sup>1</sup> II., 3, 16.

various persons, so the interpretation of Scripture will vary in various persons. Thus the religion of Christ would not be one but many. And that is indifferentism. Again, as reason is above revelation, it may accept or reject revelation. And that is Deism, which soon passes into atheism.

And not theoretically only but *practically* also—as experience makes painfully evident—is it impossible for a Protestant to grasp with certainty the genuine sense of that Book which he is never tired of proclaiming to be his one rule of faith. The Protestant heresy has had three centuries to prove to the world what principle of stability it possesses and it has shown itself unstable as quicksilver, changeful as the moon, restless as the sea, ebbing and flowing, chopping and changing, ever in a flux. That heresy started life, as Bossuet in his “Variations”<sup>1</sup> proved, by internal wranglings and disputings, by asserting and denying and modifying and explaining away. And as it began so it has continued, until the sects sprung from it have so multiplied that subtle ingenuity is required to coin for them names which shall not excite a smile. It has shown itself to be not a creed, but an amalgam of creeds, without consistency, without cohesion, with no principle of unity, with no connecting bond except that negative bond of bitter hostility to the Catholic Church. Not to mention the ephemeral sects that have been born, have flourished, have died and disappeared, who that tells over the names of that endless progeny of Protestantism chronicled by Whittaker, under the heading of “religious denominations,” will maintain that Protestantism has grasped with certainty the full and genuine sense of Holy Writ? If so, where is that genuine sense? Among the Second Advent Brethren? or the Halleluiah Band? or the Full Salvationists? or the believers in Joanna Southcott? or among the Quakers, or Jumpers, or Ranters? among the Glassites, or Free Gospellers, or Christadelphians? among the Benevolent Methodists, or the Army of the King's Own? among the Sandemanians, or the Strictly Undenominational, or the Protestants Adhering to Articles One to Eighteen?”<sup>2</sup>

Protestants, therefore, as such and in so far as they act consist-

<sup>1</sup> The argument of the *Variations* may be put in a syllogism: “The religion of Christ being based on a revelation which is unchangeable is itself unchangeable. But Protestantism is notoriously changeable. Therefore, Protestantism is not the religion of Christ.” Or thus: “The true religion is *one*, as truth is one. But Protestantism is not and does not pretend to be one. Therefore, Protestantism is not the true religion.

<sup>2</sup> The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small! They have ground Protestantism into hundreds of sects as euphoniouſly entitled as those in the text. Are not the very names of them enough to “move derision in worldlings and depraved politickes?”

ently with Protestant principles, have not and cannot have certainty in their understanding of Scripture. Consequently, as Protestants, they have not divine faith in the truths of Scripture. In this momentous conclusion—momentous because “without faith it is impossible to please God”—we are glad to have the opportunity to quote the Rev. Father Maclaughlan, who, in his admirable work, “Is One Religion as Good as Another?”<sup>1</sup> writes: “Lest I should be misunderstood (in the assertion that unless some infallible voice speaks it is impossible to make an act of faith) I wish to add: If Protestants can make an act of faith it is not *as Protestants or while resting on the principles of Protestantism.*” In other words, if Protestants make an act of faith at all, it is in virtue of an implicit obedience to that infallible voice against which their very name is a protest. Nor is this a new opinion. Balmez, in his “Protestantism and Catholicity,” chap. 4, writes: “Protestantism talks of faith, and its fundamental principle destroys it.” Again, Dr. O. A. Brownson, who was born in a Protestant community of Protestant parents and remained a Protestant until the age of forty-one, wrote:<sup>2</sup> “Protestants, in fact, have no faith; nay, so far from having any faith nearly all of them deny its possibility.”

Moreover, that faith is for them an impossibility Protestant apologists appear to recognize, implicitly at least. For, though without certainty there is no faith, they are quite ready to allow that in religion we must be satisfied with mere probability. In a work entitled “The Battle of Belief,” by the Rev. Nevison Lorraine, a Protestant clergyman in London, this doctrine seems to be enunciated.<sup>3</sup> In paragraph iii. he writes: “It is not only in matters of religion . . . that we permit ourselves to be governed . . . by a reasonable estimate of probabilities.” Again: “Possibly the religious doubter shrinks from the acceptance of the doctrines of religion . . . *on a balance of probabilities.* But the objection can only be taken by those who have not carefully considered the aspect of the question nor realized the weight which may attach to probable evidence.” More than this, he quotes with approval the following from Mr. Gladstone:<sup>4</sup> “The religious question is one in which the duty of following affirmative evidence, even though it should present to the mind no more than a *proba-*

<sup>1</sup> Appendix. This work in 1891 had already, and deservedly, reached the twenty-seventh thousand.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays on Theology*, etc., Anno 1852, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> There is much in this work deserving of praise. It is impossible not to admire the spirit in which it is conceived as well as the way in which it is executed. The good points are the author's own; the errors are those of his profession.

<sup>4</sup> “Probability as the Guide of Conduct,” *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879.

*ble character and should not ab initio or even thereafter extinguish doubt*, has the closest and most stringent application." Yet probability, as every one knows, leaves room for prudent doubt.<sup>1</sup> For, as on the one hand, certainty, even the lowest, by definition<sup>2</sup> excludes, so, on the other hand, probability, even the highest, includes the prudent fear that the opposite may be true. The opposite of a probable proposition is itself probable. If, therefore, it is only probable that the Bible is the word of God, then it is also probable, on the other hand, that the Bible is *not* the word of God. Consequently, how can any one be obliged—and that, too, under pain of eternal loss—to have faith in, *i.e.*, to believe, *without doubting*, what is, perhaps, untrue? If the Bible is only probably true, then the obligation to receive the Bible is only a probable obligation; and thus, according to the axiom *lex dubia non obligat*, a man is morally justified in withholding belief.

This Protestant doctrine of probability, propounded by Mr. Gladstone and endorsed by Mr. Lorraine, was condemned two centuries ago by Pope Innocent XI. The condemned proposition ran as follows: "The assent of faith which is supernatural and conducive to salvation is consistent with a merely probable knowledge of revelation, nay, even with the fear that God has not spoken."<sup>3</sup>

Protestantism, then, leads to indifferentism, and, in the end, to rationalism. For its subjective rule of faith, private judgment is no fixed standard, but varies in various persons, and makes unity of belief impossible. Its objective rule of faith, the Bible, is, on

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gladstone confirms this (*l. c.*): "Probability may be predicated whenever, in answer to the question whether a particular proposition be true, the affirmative chances predominate over the negative; *yet not so as (virtually) to exclude doubt.*"

<sup>2</sup> Certainty, according to Catholic writers, is made up of a double element, a negative and a positive; the former, which admits of no degrees, is the exclusion of all reasonable doubt or fear of the opposite; the latter is a positive adhesion of the mind. It is the common teaching of Catholic theologians that for supernatural faith it is an essential prerequisite that the articles of faith be, on some ground, *evidently credible*. Cf. Suarez De Vert. Theol. Disp. I., Sec. 6, St. Thomas, 2-1, q. 1, af. ad., 2d, says: "Non crederet quis nisi videret ea esse credenda vel propter *evidentiam* signorum vel aliquid hujusmodi." But the correlative of evidence is certainty.

<sup>3</sup> *Assensus fidei supernaturalis et utilis ad salutem stat cum notitia solum probabili revelationis, imo cum formidine qua quis formidet ne non sit locutus Deus.* Condemned March 2, 1679. Compare the Encycl. of Pius IX., Nov. 9, 1856: "Human reason. . . must diligently inquire into the fact of divine revelation so as to *know with certainty* that God has spoken." On the other hand, Mr. Gladstone (*l. c.*) says: "We are justified in being to the last degree suspicious of a doctrine which sets up the liberty of man as being . . . a positive ingredient in the claim of one alternative to be preferred above another." In other words, this champion of private judgment denies—seems to deny (*seems*, for his expression is vague and inaccurate)—the right to judge. Mr. Gladstone affirms—the Catholic Church denies—that you are bound to believe with divine faith before you have evidence. After all (*pace* Prof. Blackie), "the despotic and soul-stupefying sacerdotalism of the Romanists" compares not unfavorably with this unphilosophical view of the private judgmentarians.

Protestant principles, uncertain in many ways; uncertain as to its canon; uncertain as to its integrity; uncertain as to its genuine sense; uncertain as to the degree and kind of assent which it is competent to elicit. Protestantism cannot, therefore, be called a specific heresy. It is but a convenient label for a cluster or constellation of heresies developed by slow but sure evolution from that theological haze or sectarian nebula flung ha hazard into space by the great cloud-compeller, Martin Luther, and the other lesser gods of the reforming Olympus. Protestantism is the Odysseus of the heresies—*πολύμητις*—a heresy "of many shifts." It is the modern Old Man of the Sea, nimble to change its shape and assume any form by which to elude the grasp of the pursuing logician. With Gloucester, in Shakespeare's *Henry VI.*, it may truly say:

"I can add colors to the chameleon,  
Change shapes with Proteus to advantages."

It can be Ritualistic, Rationalistic, Romanish; Pantheist or Calvinist; Anglican, Lutheran, Unitarian; Low Church, Broad Church, High Church; blowing hot and blowing cold; expanding and contracting, rising and falling, according to the ever-changing pressure on the controversial barometer. It is never at a loss. From tradition it appeals to the Bible; from the Bible to the Fathers; from the Fathers to the Church, especially of "the first four centuries"; from the Church to reason and private judgment and certainty; from certainty to "probability that does not exclude doubt"; and then, as it were at last, it bolts into the covert of the "Higher Criticism" and the *zeitgeist*, only to issue forth at the other side and begin a new round of evasions, as unabashed and glib as ever, a perfect babblement of Babeldom, stiffly denying what it had before stoutly affirmed,<sup>1</sup> and presently as strongly affirming what it had just now indignantly denied; ever wonder-

<sup>1</sup> For example, is it not a historical fact that Protestantism at the outset proclaimed good works to be useless and faith alone necessary? Does not the Protestantism of to-day declare faith to be vain and good works—"a good life"—alone necessary? Did it not originally deny purgatory and accept hell? Does it not now uphold purgatory and reject hell? for God is too good, we are told by divines in high places, to burn the unrepentant sinner for all eternity; yet if hell is to end, it has ceased to be hell and has become purgatory. And is it not a fact that you may listen to one Protestant minister preaching the doctrine of the real presence and exhorting to hear Mass, while in the same city and at the same hour you may hear another Protestant minister denouncing the Eucharist and the Mass as idolatry and superstition? Macaulay (*Hist.*, chap. i.) fully recognized this "variability" of Protestantism: "Arminian doctrines which at the time of the accession of James no clergyman could have avowed without imminent risk of being stripped of his gown, were now the best title to preferment. A divine of that age, who was asked by a simple country gentleman what the Arminians held, answered with as much truth as wit, that they held all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England."

ing at your wonder, amused at your surprise, lifting its eyebrows at your scrupulosity, and quite sincerely scandalized at the narrowness of mind and rigid intolerance of the Catholic intellect that will persist in maintaining that of two contradictories both cannot at the same time be true.

Protestantism, therefore, has led—and could not but lead—to a Babel of contradictions amid the nubbub of which the English mind, seeking for truth in religion and finding none, amid the unrest of which the English heart, seeking spiritual consolation in religion and finding none, is driven out of very weariness to give up the quest in despair and to sit down perforce with any or no form of belief.

Yet indifferentism is false and without foundation in either reason or in revelation.

Indifferentism is against reason. For, let us ask, is this statement that one religion is just as good as another to be taken as a universal proposition, or as qualified by certain unstated limitations? And if as a general proposition, then let us make this further inquiry: If one religion is as good as another, is it as good to be a Buddhist as an Anglican? Is it as good to be a Mahomedan as a Methodist? Is it as good to be a follower of Confucius as to be a follower of William Penn? And if it *is* as good, why does England send out tens of thousands of pounds sterling a year for the conversion of the Buddhist and the Mohammedan and the disciple of Confucius. And if it is *not* as good, why not? If one religion is as good as another, why is not Buddhism or Mahomedanism or Confucianism as good as Anglicanism or Methodism or Quakerism? Modern enlightenment is not as yet prepared to push its theory to its full logical issue, and to assert the equality of all religions, whether Christian or Pagan. Advanced thought, for the present, limits its contention to this: that any one Christian religion is just as good as any other Christian religion. But what, we ask, is the *principle* of this limitation? If one religion is as good as another, *why* is not the worship of the non-Christian as good as the worship of the Christian? The answer comes pat enough: that faith in Christ is an essential of salvation. Well, but *why* is it an essential; on indifferentist principles? If a man is at liberty to reject *some* of the doctrines which Christ taught, and the indifferentist is satisfied with *some*, otherwise he would not be an indifferentist, why may he not reject them all? Why is a religion good if it accept some small fraction of our Lord's teaching, and yet bad if it accept none? Let the indifferentist enunciate, if he can, the principle according to which you may lawfully reject any part of Christ's teaching provided only that you do not reject the whole. The indifferentist position, in



truth, amounts to this: that a non-Christian religion is not as good as a Christian religion because at least a partial belief in Christ is an essential; but why, on his theory, it should be an essential he is quite unable to say.

But the difficulty does not stop here. We are told that even on indifferentist principles, belief in Christ is an essential condition of salvation. Now does the indifferentist mean by this, belief in Christ as God or only as man? If he means belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ, then even Christian religions cannot all be equally good, and therefore indifferentism is false. For example, the Unitarians are a Christian sect and yet they deny the divinity of Jesus. Is then Unitarianism as good as any other religion? If it is, then faith in Christ, as God, is not an essential. If it is not, then the theory is false that any one Christian religion is as good as any other Christian religion. To save his position, therefore, the indifferentist is driven to confess that faith in Christ as man, is enough. But if this be true, indifferentism must become more elastic; it must open out its arms wider so as to embrace those non-Christian religions that believe in Christ as man. For example, he must include the Mohammedans who believe in Christ as man.<sup>1</sup> But in this case the liberal in religion must withdraw the limitation with which he started and must allow that if one religion is just as good as another, it is as good to be a non-Christian as a Christian; it is as good to be a Mahomedan as a Methodist. And if that view be correct, we may be allowed to ask again why Methodists subscribe so liberally towards Christian missions to the Mahomedans?

"One religion is as good as another." It follows, therefore, that the particular doctrine, the characteristic note, the distinguishing tenet which differentiates one Christian religion from another is unnecessary for salvation. You need not be a Catholic and may reject infallibility. You need not be an Anglican and may reject the Divinity of Christ. You may join the Greek Church and reject the procession of the Holy Ghost. You may be a Unitarian and reject the Trinity. With the Presbyterian you may reject Episcopacy. With the Plymouth Brethren you may reject an external priesthood. With Anglicans you may reject five of the seven sacraments. In a word, if indifferentism be true, for every Christian sect that ever has existed, does exist, or shall exist you may reject some point of the teaching of Jesus Christ, and as the name of these sects is legion, so legion must be the heads of the doctrine taught by Christ which are unnecessary for salvation. To

<sup>1</sup> Turien felt this difficulty and cut the knot by confessing that "les Mahométans ne sont qu'une secte du Christianisme," *Le vrai Systeme*, p. 237. Nor was Hoadley less tolerant. Cf. Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, Chap. 8.

sum this up, if the indifferentist will but calculate the amount of agreement among the Christian sects he will find that, differing from each other at every turn, they are unanimous in little more than this, that there exists a God who must be worshipped and adored. But the Buddhist and Mahommedan and Confucionist also, teach that there exists a God of some sort who must be worshipped and adored; and thus we are led back to the question originally proposed, if one religion is as good as another, why is not Buddhism and Mahommedanism and the creed of Confucius as good as Anglicanism or Methodism or the creed of William Penn?

That is the first objection, drawn from reason, against indifferentism; it degrades Christianity and leads to Paganism. I now go on to show that it degrades God and leads to Atheism.

For if there is one fact concerning Almighty God which plain reasoning makes more certain than another, it is that God is truthful and loves the truth. Even with a man, the deepest insult you can offer him is to dub him a liar and a lover of lies. Who then but a blasphemer would have the folly to say of God that *He* loves untruth? When our Lord described Satan, His arch enemy—the antithesis and antipodes of God—He called him a liar and the father of lies. God, therefore, loves the truth. But more than this, God *is* the truth. As our Saviour Himself said, “Ego sum Veritas.” “*I am the Truth.*” Truth is of the very essence and substance of God. Consequently, God not only does in fact love the truth, but by the very exigencies of His being, He is necessitated to love it. God can no more cease to love truth than He can cease to be God, and to conceive Him as loving error is, by conception, to destroy His Godhead. By a law of His being God hates falsehood with a measureless and undying hatred.

Now to be an indifferentist and to assert that God is as well satisfied with one religion as with another is to make God a lover of untruth. The proof is easy.

For these different religions contradict one another. Now of two contradictory propositions one is true, the other is false. Two contradictories cannot both be true. Given the truth of one, the falsehood of the other necessarily follows. To demonstrate the evident truth of the one is, by the very fact, to demonstrate the evident falsehood of the other. So that if two religions hold contradictory doctrines, one of the two must inevitably be teaching error. For example, one creed asserts the existence of hell where mortal sin unforgiven is punished eternally. Another creed denies the existence of hell. Again, one creed teaches that faith alone, without good works, is sufficient for salvation. Another creed denies that faith alone is sufficient for salvation. Once more, one

creed maintains that the Pope is infallible and enjoys universal jurisdiction. Another creed denies the infallibility of the Pope and contends that his jurisdiction is limited. Now of these six contradictory propositions chosen by way of specimen, three are necessarily true, the contradictory three are just as necessarily false. Either there is a hell or there is not. If there is, then the sect that denies the existence of hell obviously teaches error. Either faith alone without good works is sufficient for salvation, or it is not. If it is not, then the sect which denies the value of good works obviously teaches error. Either the Pope is infallible or he is not. If he is, then the sect which denies papal infallibility obviously teaches error.

To say, therefore, that God is equally pleased with all religions is the same thing as to say that God is equally pleased with truth and error. It is the same thing as to say that God is like the devil, a liar and a lover of lies. It is the same thing as to say that God has ceased to be God. Consequently indifferentism, both in theory and practice, leads to atheism. To affirm that one religion is as good as another, is, as far as lies in man's power, to pluck God down from His throne.

But the indifferentist is not quite run to earth yet. He has still one little pin-prick of a hole by which to escape. For, he says, although the different religions do indeed contradict one another, still the points of difference are minor, trivial, unimportant; while the points of agreement are solid, substantial, fundamental. The difference is accidental, the agreement essential.

Yes, that is the usual answer to the argument just put forward—an answer too foolish and too flimsy to call for a serious reply.

For is it a trivial question whether for all eternity the condemned sinner is to burn in hell-fire or is not? Is it accidental and unimportant whether in receiving the Holy Eucharist you receive the real and true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ or you do not? Is it not fundamental whether a priest can forgive sins duly confessed or cannot? Is it not essential whether the Pope is endowed with infallibility or is not? And if any indifferentist has the hardihood to contend that these points are not fundamental, then let him furnish us with a rule by which to distinguish fundamentals from non-fundamentals. "Question," says the Protestant Jurieu, "*epineuse et difficile à décider!*" If private judgment renders agreement in religion impossible, it also renders impossible agreement as to what are the fundamentals in religion. For example, is infant baptism a fundamental? The Anglican affirms, the Baptist denies it. Is belief in the Trinity a fundamental? The Baptist affirms, the Unitarian denies it. And in opposition to all the sects the Catholic Church

teaches that everything is fundamental which God has revealed and the Church has proposed for our belief.

We have now shown that indifferentism is a contradiction of reason; it degrades Christianity and leads to Paganism; it degrades Almighty God and leads to atheism.

Moreover, that this fashionable theory is not less opposed to revelation than to reason is clear as the noonday sun. It seems, however, useless to press this point since the argument from reason is so overwhelming that if it does not convince, nothing will. There is also this further objection to drawing out the Scriptural condemnation of indifferentism, that the very persons, in controversy with whom we appeal to the Bible, will persist in fixing their attention exclusively on some particular text which seems to make for their own pet heresy. Each sect, in practice, rejects that part of the Bible which condemns its own particular errors; and thus, though the assertion is ever being dinned into our ears that Catholics make little, and Protestants make much, of the Word of God, yet it is as assuredly true that the Catholic Church alone accepts the whole Bible as that the Protestant sects *collectively* reject the whole.<sup>1</sup> Each sect, in practice, rejects or misinterprets that part of Scripture which condemns its own heresy; and as the sects are beyond number, and as each sect has its own distinguishing heresy, the doctrines of Scripture which the sects, taken together, reject, can scarce be counted, consequently it is accurate to say that Protestantism, the collective name for the sects, rejects the Bible.

Such being the case, it would not appear to be of much use to point out that an addition to, or a subtraction from, revelation spoils the whole of our Lord's teaching; that the gospel of Christ is not a heterogeneous collection of disconnected statements and uncorrelated truths, but a compact and organic body of systematized doctrines, every part of which has a vital relation to every other part; a body of which not only the symmetry is marred, but the very life is taken away by extraneous addition or substantial subtraction. You might as well cut the telegraph wires and then try by the electric current to learn the thoughts of a distant correspondent as lop and top and prune away the doctrines of Christ and then attempt therefrom to grasp "the mind

---

<sup>1</sup> Think of the amount of heresy that has clustered round such a text as: "Justus ex fide vivit" (Rom., i. 17, etc.). "The just man liveth by faith." It was on the strength of this and similar texts and of the doctrine of "Justification by faith alone," falsely deduced from the texts, that Luther bade his followers: "Pecca fortiter sed crede fortius." "Sin deeply, but believe more deeply." It mattered little to Luther that St. James and others had scotched this heresy in the text: "By works a man is justified and *not* by faith alone" (2, 24).

of Christ."<sup>1</sup> It is hard to understand how a Protestant can stand in the midst of the sects—while they hack and hew at the body of teaching which Christ gave to the world—while they make profession of every shade and phase of belief, unbelief and misbelief, and from the midst of this miscellaneous multitude can raise his hand and claim that *he* has the gospel of Christ; how he can read his Bible and not find matter for pause in that emphatic prayer of Christ to the Father, recorded by St. John,<sup>2</sup> that the children of the Church "may be *one* as we also are one"; how he can read without alarm that prophecy of Christ, recorded by the same apostle,<sup>3</sup> that "there shall be *one* fold and *one* shepherd," or that of another apostle,<sup>4</sup> that there is "*one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism"; how he can read in the gospels and not have forever ringing in his ears that solemn commission which Christ gave to his apostles and their successors to go and teach "*all* things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth not shall be condemned";<sup>5</sup> how he can read and not stand and gaze "like Joshua's moon in Ajalon," when in that epistle to the Galatians he comes to the vehement language of St. Paul, pronouncing, in all the simplicity and fervor of his apostolic spirit, on the head of him who shall add to or take away from the Gospel of Christ and thereby turn that gospel into another gospel which is not another, that terrible "Let him be Anathema." By what process of reasoning does the "Bible Christian" make his indifferentism square with that most emphatic and twice repeated condemnation of the "perverters" of Christ's Gospel? "I wonder that you are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel which is not another; only there are some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we (the apostles) *or an angel from heaven* preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be ANATHEMA. As we said before, so now I say again, if any one preach to you a gospel other than that which you have received, let him be ANATHEMA." If St. Paul were sent down from heaven to-morrow to pronounce on modern indifferentism, it is hard to see what stronger language than this he could use.

But, it is often said, if the indifferentist accept some fragments of Christ's teaching, and be doing his best, may he not hope to be saved? Doing his best! Can it be said that any reasonable being, who thinks at all, and yet holds to such a hotch potch of open contradictions and glaring absurdities as indifferentism implies, is really doing his best? And if it be replied that there

<sup>1</sup> I. Cor., 2, 16.<sup>2</sup> 17, 11.<sup>3</sup> 10, 16.<sup>4</sup> Ephes., 4, 5.<sup>5</sup> Mt., 28, 19; Mk., 16, 16.

exist people so dull, or so prejudiced, or so preoccupied as conscientiously and after every effort made, not to see their way out of this intellectual jungle, then we must call attention to these cardinal texts of Holy Writ that "without faith it is impossible to please God."<sup>1</sup> "Teaching them to observe *all* things; he who believes not shall be condemned." By faith, a living faith, a faith energizing in a good life, we are justified. Faith is the basis of the whole edifice of that spiritual life upon which salvation depends. Yet it would be hard to show how the indifferentist has faith—how he "believes without doubting" *all* that Christ has revealed—since his creed is that any religion is as good as any other. There is a condemned proposition—syllabus No. 18—which clearly guides us to the mind of the Church on this subject. The erroneous proposition runs as follows: "Protestantism is nothing else than a diverse form of the same true Christian religion, in which, as well as in the Catholic Church, it is given to please God." The indifferentist, therefore—to take the most rosy view of his future prospects—has small reason for self-gratulation in his indifferentism.

Nor is this all. There is another phase or fact of indifference to which we allude with much diffidence, because in a paper such as the present the writer's motive is liable to be construed into a desire for a controversial victory; and yet a phase of such practical import that no Catholic, and, above all, no priest, who has the salvation of souls at heart, can well pass it over in silence. For even if it be true that there is in the well-meaning indifferentist some sort of vague and inchoate faith which the goodness of our Father in heaven will, in the mysteries of His Providence, accept as solid and sterling coin of the spiritual mint, there still remains another question which solemnly and imperatively clamors for an answer. The indifferentist, like the rest of mankind, is a sinner. There is no uncharity, we hope, in that assumption. The holiest, the wisest, the strongest—David, Solomon, Samson—fell; nor is there aught in the liberal principles of the indifferentist to suppose that he is in morals above the common lot of men. If sin is so rampant, even among those who enjoy abundant help of the sacraments, the indifferentist is not likely without that aid to escape a fall—at least one fall. For, to give a foothold to our argument, one sin is sufficient. One serious fall is enough to occasion the supremely important question to which we refer, namely, *How is that sin to be forgiven?* Our merciful Lord has established a tribunal for the forgiveness of sin, the tribunal of confession. But the indifferentist rejects confession. Where then and how shall he find remittance? There is but one way—by

---

<sup>1</sup> Heb., 11, 6.

an act of "perfect contrition." An act, however, of perfect contrition is not so easily elicited. Nay, we do not think it is harsh or anything but theological to say that it cannot be elicited without grave difficulty, and, in rare cases, by one who has lived long in the utterly unspiritual atmosphere of indifference. Men only do easily what they have a *habit* of doing, and the indifferentist, we fear, has not a habit of contrition. It is only a hallucination, it is a mere clutching at straws for the indifferentist to flatter himself that, having cast away far from him the normal means of forgiveness instituted and put within his grasp by our Saviour, having lived his life in minimizing and underestimating the teachings of His Divine Master, God will then give him easily and at once the transcendent grace of that sweet bruising of the heart we call contrition; to repent, not merely from a selfish motive touching personal interests, to repent, not merely from a motive of hope or fear—such as that by sin he has forfeited heaven and deserved hell—but from the supreme and sublime motive of charity or perfect love of God. The indifferentist who would cleanse his soul of sin by an act of perfect contrition must be chiefly and formally moved in that act—not necessarily so as to exclude, but certainly not so as to be primarily impelled by the lower considerations of hope and fear—by the selfless motive of pure love of God for God's own sake, whom he must love above all created things so as, if occasion arose, to be willing to endure any privation or any pain rather than offend God by a grievous sin. That such an act in such a case seems difficult none can deny; that it is impossible no theologian will insinuate. Heretics, indeed, as such and in so far as they knowingly persevere in that heresy, cannot be saved. Such, however, are probably few—"rari nantes in gurgite vasto." But there are many whose heresy is material only and not formal; who, invincibly ignorant, are in good faith and therefore belong to the *soul* of the Church, though separate from the visible communion. Of such, these were the consoling words uttered by Pius IX. in his encyclical to the Italian Episcopate, August 10, 1863: "It is known to us and to you that those who are in invincible ignorance of our holy religion and who, carefully fulfilling the natural law and the precepts thereof inscribed by God in the hearts of all, besides being in the disposition to obey God, live a good and upright life—can, by the aid of divine light and grace, attain to life eternal."

But none the less, indifferentism is the great moral curse of our age. It was intimated that when Christ cometh He shall scarcely find faith upon the earth. And that is what indifferentism is bringing the world to.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

MARYLAND OR RHODE ISLAND—LORD BALTIMORE OR ROGER WILLIAMS—WHICH WAS FIRST?

IT has always been a proud boast of Catholics in America that the first example, among the original thirteen colonies, of a State, in an age of persecution, laying its very foundation upon the broad principle of religious liberty, was the Catholic Colony of Maryland. Historians have conceded this honorable distinction and precedence to Catholic Maryland, and the authorities quoted in support of the Catholic claim have been mostly Protestant authorities, who have been profuse in their eulogies of Lord Baltimore and the Catholics of Maryland, who, by their tolerance towards the professors of every Christian sect, when intolerance was driving men for conscience sake from other American colonies, won for Maryland the title of "Land of the Sanctuary."

Rhode Island, too, and Roger Williams, its founder, have won historic honor by the same exalted practice of religious tolerance, and in opening the new colony of Providence to men of every creed. Lord Baltimore announced as the fundamental law of his colony that he would not by himself, nor any person, directly nor indirectly, trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatever, in the said province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ. Roger Williams, too, in the same spirit of benevolence, laid the foundations of his colony on the announcement that its citizens owed obedience to the civil authority, represented by the majority, only in civil matters. Lord Baltimore and Roger Williams both endured persecution for the cause of freedom of worship and religious liberty.

The late eminent Cardinal Manning, after stating what Lord Baltimore did for freedom of conscience, thus proceeds to state the fundamental principle involved in the toleration practiced in Maryland: "Such was the commonwealth founded by a Catholic upon the broad moral law I have here laid down—that faith is an act of the will, and that to force men to profess what they do not believe is contrary to the law of God, and to generate faith by force is morally impossible."<sup>1</sup>

Some twenty years ago an attempt was made in Protestant sources

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, etc., N. Y. edition, Harpers, p. 88.



on both sides of the Atlantic to dispute the claim of Catholic Maryland to the meed of praise which the voice of history had always given to her and to Lord Baltimore without previous contradiction; but it was promptly met and refuted by a descendant of one of the Catholic founders of Maryland, a reply which the late Dr. John Gilmary Shea pronounced "a triumphant vindication." The pamphlet then or previously published by the Rev. Ethan Allen fully discloses the nature of the ground then assumed by the opponents of the Catholic claim by its title, "Maryland Not a Catholic Colony." Since that time no attempts have been made to dispute the prestige gained by Lord Baltimore and the Catholics of Maryland. During this interval, two important works have appeared on the subject, "The Foundation of Maryland," by General Bradley T. Johnson, and "The History of Maryland," by J. Thomas Scarf.

In the present paper the writer proposes to show that, although Maryland was not the only one of the old thirteen colonies to build the commonwealth on the basis of religious liberty, *she was the first*. Rhode Island came nearest to Maryland in point of time, and if any State could claim to contest the honor with Maryland, it would be Rhode Island. A consideration of historic dates, and the presentation of the highest historical authorities, we think, will establish the prior claim of Maryland.

The earliest date assigned for the foundation of Rhode Island as a new colony, and consequently for the first possible act of Roger Williams, its founder, in favor of religious liberty, was 1636, when Roger Williams prepared the compact amongst its colonists, and which stood at the beginning of the first record-book of Providence Plantations. By this compact the citizens of Rhode Island were obliged to bind themselves "to be obedient to the orders of the majority only in civil things." This certainly was a charter of religious liberty, which sheds renown on Roger Williams and the State he founded. The date of this event is important in our present inquiry. The compact of citizenship and of religious liberty in Rhode Island being placed in 1636, our history will clearly demonstrate that religious liberty in Maryland was of a prior date.

While religious toleration in Rhode Island unquestionably and admittedly dates its beginning with this compact of Roger Williams and his colonists, it would be a grave historical error to assign the beginning of religious liberty in Maryland to the year 1648, when the oath of office, guaranteeing religious liberty, was prescribed by Lord Baltimore for all persons holding office under his government. The Rhode Island compact, as written by Roger Williams, was: "We, whose names are hereunder, desirous to in-

habit in the town of Providence, do promise to subject ourselves, in active or passive obedience, to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for public good of the body, in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together in a town fellowship, and others whom they shall admit into the same, *only in civil things.*" From this the inference is conceded fairly that they were free in all religious matters. The Maryland oath, however, ran as follows: "I do further swear that I will not by myself, nor any person, directly nor indirectly, *trouble, molest, or discountenance, any person whatever, in the said Province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, and in particular no Roman Catholic, for or in respect of his or her religion, nor his or her free exercise thereof within this Province,* so as they be not unfaithful to his said lordship, or molest or conspire against the civil government established here under him."

And in addition to the above official oath, which was required by Lord Baltimore of the governor and council, there was added to the oath required by the governor the following remarkable passage: "Nor will I make any difference of persons in conferring offices, rewards or favors proceeding from the authority which his said lordship hath conferred upon me, as his lieutenant here, *for or in respect of their said religion* respectively, but merely as I shall find them faithful and well deserving of his said lordship, and to the best of my understanding, endowed with moral virtues and abilities, fitting for such rewards, offices or favors, wherein my prime aim and end, from time to time, shall sincerely be the advancement of his said lordship's service here, and the public unity and good of the Province, without partiality to any, or any other sinister end whatsoever, and if any other officer, or person whatsoever, shall, during the time of my being his said lordship's lieutenant here, without my consent, or privity, molest or disturb any person within this province professing to believe in Jesus Christ, merely for or in respect of his or her religion, or the free exercise thereof, upon notice or complaint thereof made to me, I will apply my power and authority to relieve and protect such person and to punish the persecutor," etc.

These official oaths are important, and still more so is the famous Religious Liberty Act, which formed a part of the enlightened policy of Lord Baltimore in Maryland. And we set forth here both the foregoing official oaths and the Act of Religious Liberty of 1649, since they have never before appeared in the pages of this REVIEW, and because they show the real state of the law in Catholic Maryland on the subject of religious liberty under Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, the actual founder of the colony.

As a matter of history, it should be stated that Lord Baltimore

in England prepared these official oaths, and the Toleration Act, and sent them over to Maryland in order that the Toleration Act and fifteen other acts should be enacted by the assembly. The Toleration Act was the first of the sixteen acts passed; it was enacted by the assembly on April 21, 1649. The names of the law-givers of 1649, who enacted the Maryland Toleration Act, constitute a roll of honor which should be known and remembered by every American Catholic more sacredly than the school-boys of Ancient Greece were required to remember the names of the three hundred patriots who died at Thermopilæ defending the liberties of their country. Their names, the Catholics being printed in italics, are: *Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore*, Lieut. Governor Stone, *Ex-Governor Thomas Green, Robert Clarke*, John Price, Robert Vaughan, *Cuthbert Fenwick*, Philip Conner, *William Bretton*, Richard Browne, *George Manners*, Richard Banks, *John Maunsell, Thomas Thornborough, Walter Peake*. It will thus be seen that nine Catholics and six Protestants co-operated in enacting this great statute of religious liberty. In addition to the foregoing oaths of office, and the *following* statute, the entire settlement, every person residing in Maryland, was required to take an oath reserving "Libertie of Conscience in point of Religion *to himself and all other persons.*" We will now give the text of the Maryland Toleration Act:

#### "AN ACT CONCERNING RELIGION.

"Forasmuch as in a well-governed and Christian commonwealth matters concerning religion and the honor of our God ought, in the first place, to bee taken into serious consideration, and indoevoured to be settled, Bee it therefore ordayned and enacted by the right honorable Cecilius lord baron of Baltimore, absolute lord and proprietary of this province, with the advice and consent of the upper and lower house of the general assembly, that whatsoever person or persons within this province, and the islands thereunto belonging, shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is, to curse Him, or shall deny our Savior Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost or the Godhead of any of the sayd Three Persons of the Trinity, or the Unity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful speeches, words or language concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the sayd three persons thereof, shall be punished with death, and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her lands and goods to the lord proprietary and his heires.

"And bee it also enacted by the authority and with the advice and assent aforesaid, that whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or speeches con-

cerning the blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Savior, or the Holy Apostles or Evangelists, or any of them, shall in such case for the first offence forfeit to the sayd lord proprietary and his heires, lords and proprietaries of this province, the sum of 5*£* sterling, or the value thereof, to bee levied on the goods and chattels of every such person so offending; but in case such offender or offenders shall not then have goods and chattels sufficient for the satisfying of such forfeiture, or that the same be not otherwise speedily satisfied, that then such offender or offenders shall be publickly whipt, and be imprisoned during the pleasure of the lord proprietary or the lieutenant or the chief governour of this province for the time being; and that every such offender or offenders, for every second offence, shall forfeit 10*£* sterling, or the value thereof, to be levied as aforesayd, or in any case such offender or offenders shall not then have goods or chattels within this province sufficient for that purpose, then to be quickly and severely whipt and imprisoned as is before expressed; and that every person or persons before mentioned offending herein the third time shall for such third offence forfeit all his lands and goods, and be forever banisht and expelled out of this province.

“And bee it also further enacted by the same authority, advice and assent, that whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth upon any occasion of offence or otherwise in a reproachful manner or way, declare, call or denominate any person or persons whatsoever inhabiting, residing, trafficking, trading or commercing within this province, or within any the ports, harbour, creeks or havens, to the same belonging, an Heretick, Schismatic, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Separatist, or other name or term, in a reproachful manner, relating to a matter of religion, shall for every such offence forfeit and lose the sum of 10*£* sterling, or the value thereof to be levied on the goods and chattels of every such offender or offenders, the one-halfe thereof to be forfeited and paid unto the person or persons of whom such reproachful words are, or shall be, spoken or uttered, and the other halfe to the lord proprietary and his heirs, lords and proprietaries of this province; but if such person or persons, who shall at any time utter or speak any such reproachful words or language, shall not have goods or chattels sufficient or overt within this province to be taken to satisfy the penalty aforesaid, or that the same bee not otherwise speedily satisfied, that then the person or persons so offending shall be publickly whipt and shall suffer imprisonment without bayle or mainprize until he, she or they shall respectfully satisfy the party offended or grieved by such reproachful language by

asking him or her respectively forgiveness publicly for such his offence before the magistrate or chiefe officer or officers of the towne or place where such offence shall be given.

“ And bee it further likewise enacted by the authority and consent aforesayd, that every person or persons within this province, that shall at any time hereafter prophane the Sabaath or Lord's day called Sunday by frequent swearing, drunkenesse, or by any un-civille or disorderly recreation, or by working on that day when absolute necessity doth not require, shall for every first offence forfeit 2s. 6d. sterling, or the value thereof; and for the second offence, 5s. sterling or the value thereof; and for the third offence, and for every time he shall offend in like manner afterwards, 10s. sterling or the value thereof; and in case such offender or offenders shall not have sufficient goods or chattels within this province to satisfie any of the aforesaid penalties respectively hereby imposed for profaning the Sabaath or Lord's day called Sunday as aforesayd, then in every such case the party so offending shall for the first and second offence in that kind bee imprissoned till he or she shall publicly in open court, before the chiefe commander, Judge or magistrate of that county, towne, or precinct, wherein such offence shall be committed, acknowledge the scandall and offence hee hath in that respect given against God and the good and civil government of this province; and for the third offence, and for every time after, shall also bee publicly whipt.

“ And whereas the forcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath beene practiced, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutuall love and unity amongst the inhabitants here. Bee it therefore also by the lord proprietary, with the advice and assent of this assembly, ordaned and enacted, except as in this present act is before declared and set forth, that no person or persons whatsoever within this province or the islands, ports, harbour, creeks or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall from henceforth be any waise troubled, molested or discountenanced, for or in his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof, within this province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to beleefe or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent, so as they be not unfaithful unto the lord proprietary, or molest or conspire against the civil government established or to be established in this province under him and his heires; and that all or every person or persons that shall presume contrary to this act, and the true intent and meaning thereof, directly or indirectly, eyther in person or estate, wilfully to wrong, disturb, or trouble, or molest any person

or persons whatsoever within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for or in respect of his or her religion or the free exercise thereof within this province, otherwise than is provided for in this act, that such person or persons so offending shall bee compelled to pay treble damages to the party wronged or molested, and for every such offence shall also forfeit 20s. sterling, in money or the value thereof, half thereof for the use of the lord proprietary and his heires, lords and proprietaries of the province, and the other halfe thereof for the use of the partie so wronged and molested as aforesayd; or if the party so offending as aforesayd shall refuse or bee unable to recompense the party so wronged, or to satisfie such fine or forfeiture, then such offender shall be severely punished by publick whipping and imprisonment during the pleasure of the lord proprietary or his lieutenant or the chiefe governour of this province for the time being, without bail or mainprize.

“And bee it further also enacted by the authority and consent aforesayd, that the sheriffe or other officer or officers from time to time to be appointed and authorized for that purpose of the county, towne or precinct, where every particular offence, in this present act contained, shall happen at any time to be committed, and whereunto there is hereby a forfeiture, fine or penalty imposed, shall from time to time distrain and seise the goods and estate of every such person so offending as aforesayd against this present act or any part thereof and sell the same or any part thereof for the full satisfaction of such forfeiture, fine or penalty as aforesayd, restoring to the party so offending the remainder or overplus of the said goods and estate after such satisfaction so made as aforesayd.”

Having shown the exact condition of the law in Maryland in respect to religious liberty in 1648, under the public and official oath then required, and more especially under the law of religious liberty, then already prepared by Lord Baltimore in England in 1649; the true question now arises, What was the law in respect to religious liberty in Maryland, what was the practice, policy and actual administration in Maryland in this regard prior to 1648 and 1649? Also at the time that Roger Williams founded Rhode Island with religious liberty as its basis in 1636? And, still more important for our present purpose, what was the condition prior to that? What was the law and practice in Maryland from the first landing of the Maryland Catholic pilgrims in 1634 to 1636? Did religious tolerance in Maryland begin to be practiced by the Catholic colony and its founder for the first time in 1648 and 1649? Did the official oath formulated in 1648 and the Toleration Act of 1649 give

its first origin to religious liberty in Maryland, or had it been practiced from the first foundation of the colony in 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded by Roger Williams?

Was not the benign policy of religious toleration the actual and avowed purpose of the Catholic Proprietary of Maryland, George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, from the time of his conversion to the Catholic faith, in 1624, until his Catholic colonists, under the leadership of his brother and lieutenant-governor, Leonard Calvert, landed at St. Clements, in Maryland, on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1634? When the first Mass was celebrated by the Jesuit father, Andrew White, in 1634, then was not Maryland, in fact and in deed, "The Land of the Sanctuary," The Home of Religious Liberty?

These are questions which must be sifted in order to determine whether it was to Roger Williams and Rhode Island, and not to Maryland and Lord Baltimore, the credit is due of being "the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power."<sup>1</sup>

George Calvert was one of the most rising men in England at a time when none but Protestants could rise to eminence to office and emoluments. A graduate of Oxford, a man of fine education and extensive travel, befriended by Sir Robert Cecil, advanced to the rank of knighthood, appointed one of the two secretaries of State, a favorite of his sovereign, and an idol with the people of his native Yorkshire, who had sent him by an immense majority to represent them in Parliament. Such was the man of whom Bancroft says: "In an age when religious controversy still continued to be active and when increasing divisions among Protestants were spreading a general alarm, his mind sought relief from controversy in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, and, preferring the avowal of his opinions to the emoluments of office, he resigned his place and openly professed his conversion." At the time of Lord Baltimore's conversion, in 1624, with sacrifice of the emoluments of office for conscience sake, and while, already seeking an asylum where the conscience would be free, Roger Williams was an Episcopalian, enjoying the patronage of Sir Edward Coke, whose favor he won by his short-hand notes of sermons and of speeches in the star chamber, and who secured for him a scholarship in the Charter-house, admittance and a matriculated pensionership in Pembroke College, Cambridge.

King James, who was not personally harsh to Catholics, was so moved by admiration for the manly and conscientious conduct of

---

<sup>1</sup> George Bancroft.

Sir George Calvert in renouncing his worldly prospects for his religious convictions that he insisted on retaining him as a member of the privy council, regranted to him the estates in Ireland which he had relinquished rather than comply with conditions a Catholic could not accept and exempted him from those conditions, and as a reward for his long and faithful services raised him to the peerage under the title of Baron of Baltimore.

But Lord Baltimore was not content to enjoy exemptions, honors and emoluments when he saw his fellow-Catholics suffering under the cruel penal laws of England. To offer up the Holy Mass, that sublime act of worship which Catholics felt bound to offer to their God, was a capital offense. Heavy fines were imposed on such as dared to defend the jurisdiction of the Pope, solely spiritual as that jurisdiction was. The oath of *spiritual supremacy* in the temporal prince or king was required by all applying for admission to the universities, the learned professions and public offices in the service of their country. Thus Catholics were excluded from schools and institutions founded by their ancestors. A second refusal to take the oath of spiritual supremacy was punished with death. But a few priests escaped the gallows and these were secreted in the houses of the faithful to whom they administered in secret the blessings of their religion at the risk of life. Laws were enacted to thwart the education of English priests at Douay for the precarious missions carried on secretly among English Catholic families; for it was by this means that English Catholics sought to supply the places of the aged priests who thus surreptitiously ministered and whose ranks were decimated first by the rapid work of the gallows and secondly by the inevitable process of death. Priests were not permitted to be educated or trained even abroad for their sacred calling in England. It was made high treason to declare the English sovereign a heretic or to bring from Rome any brief, bull or other Papal document or to use or recognize any such document emanating from the Pope. It was high treason to give or receive absolution. To possess or use an *Agnus Dei*, a rosary, a cross or a picture blessed by the Pope or by any of his missionaries was punished with perpetual imprisonment. If any Catholic fled from England to escape the excruciating penalties of these bloody laws, a code of cruelty, confiscation, imprisonment and death, well-likened to "Egyptian slavery and Scythian cruelty," he was required to return to England within six months under penalty of confiscation of all his worldly goods and possessions; as if this code of blood gloated in the delight of its cruel work, sought its victims as a deadly pestilence seeks its own and struggled to prevent their escape to freer lands. We have records of a book-dealer being



sentenced to be nailed to the pillory for having Catholic books on sale; of a priest convicted of high treason for having in his possession an *Agnus Dei* and for carrying on his person a bull of the Pope granting a jubilee, and he, like many others, expiated his simple piety on the gallows, as year after year the glorious line of martyrs were led to death. The laity were fined and imprisoned for not attending Protestant worship or for hearing Mass or for keeping Catholic books, the *Agnus Dei*, the cross or the rosary.

It was under such circumstances as these that Lord Baltimore, a Catholic nobleman in favor at court and enjoying immunities under a friendly sovereign, aspired to be the leader of his fellow-Catholics less fortunate than himself in seeking for them, though not for himself in distant lands an asylum from oppression and a home where the conscience would be unshackled. His conversion was in 1624; but as early as April, 7, 1623, one year before he accepted the cross in lieu of the coronet, he, meditating upon and in anticipation of his heroic steps and the further struggle in behalf of his suffering fellow-Catholics sought and obtained from the king a charter, and that a liberal one, for the province of Avalon in Newfoundland.

Such were the evils and wrongs under which English Catholics groaned, suffered and died that several efforts had been made by Catholic gentlemen or noblemen to found a colony in Newfoundland as a refuge from the bigoted persecution of the government at home. Such were the efforts of Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard, in 1583, and that of Winslade, in 1605, whereby they endeavored to convene the persecuted Catholics of England on the continent and to convey these exiles of conscience to an asylum in the new world; and such the expedition sent out in the same year under Captain Weymouth by Sir Thomas, Lord Arundel of Wardour, and Henry Wriethesly, second Earl of Southampton.

George Calvert's efforts to open an asylum for his fellow-Catholics now followed, in 1627, and was the precursor of the more successful attempt which was subsequently made and resulted in the foundation of Maryland. Not only was it the design of this noble Lord Baltimore to seek a home for the oppressed Catholics of England, but it was his nobler purpose to go with them himself into exile, that he might share their labors, sufferings, efforts and sacrifices; for in the case of his own sacrifice, that of a favored nobleman at home, it was infinitely greater than that of his followers; for he could have remained in England and enjoyed honors, exemptions and wealth and have enjoyed his religion there through the ministry of a private chaplain residing in his castle with the connivance of the government.

He was now in equal favor with Charles I. as he had been with King James. He had previously been interested in American colonization and adventures, and he was no doubt a landed proprietor in Avalon ; now he became the Lord Proprietary of the province, and the leader of Catholic pilgrims seeking freedom of religion and of worship. His intimate relations with the Catholic Lord Arundel of Wardour and connection by marriage with the family of Arundels, and the similarity of the Avalon charter to that which he subsequently obtained for Maryland, prove in advance his designs from the beginning to found a colony where religious liberty would be the corner-stone of the commonwealth. But the sequel proves even more of his noble purposes, and yet still more of his nobler execution of them.

Lord Baltimore embarked with his colonists in 1627 and arrived at Ferryland in Avalon on July 23d, carrying with him two seminary priests, Fathers Longvill and Anthony Smith, and a Catholic chapel was erected in which Mass was regularly said. But as the colonists were not all Catholics, George Calvert immediately put in operation the most perfect system of Religious Toleration, and he provided a place of worship and a clergyman for the Protestant colonists. It is a curious circumstance, showing the extent to which English persecution of Catholics was then carried, that the minister, Rev. Mr. Stourton, to whom and to whose flock Lord Baltimore had given a chapel, afterwards, on his return to England, preferred charges against his liberal benefactor *for permitting Mass to be said in Avalon.*

But Lord Baltimore was not deterred by the bigotry of others from practicing the most exalted justice, equality, toleration and beneficence to others. After a brief stay in the colony he returned to England accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Longvill. But in the following year he again sailed to Avalon accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Hacket, and by his own wife and children, thus making his permanent home and sharing a hard and distant colonial life with his people. It was said by Dr. John Gilmary Shea, in his "History of the Catholic Church in the United States," vol. i., pp. 31, 32, that "Lord Baltimore, in practically placing both religions on an equal footing, making both tacitly sanctioned, giving religious freedom to all, rose pre-eminently above his time. He nobly endeavored in Avalon to enable each class of settlers to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, and it was brought up against him as a crime. Taught by his rude experience, we shall see that in his next experiment, he left each class to provide ministers of religion for themselves, or neglect to do so as they preferred."

But this effort to plant a free colony at Avalon, like the previ-

vious ones, did not prove a success. Its remoteness, the severity of the climate, its ungenerous soil, the restrictions of the mother-country upon the fisheries, and the conflicts in which he had to defend his colony against the attacks of the French, convinced him that success could not crown his efforts. In 1829, Lord Baltimore embarked on shipboard with his wife and several of his children, with the priests and all his colonists, and abandoned Avalon, where it had been his brave and noble struggle to lay the broad foundations of the commonwealth upon the just basis of civil and religious liberty. His principal ship in carrying out the colony was the *Ark of Avalon*, as the *Ark of Maryland* was afterwards the floating chapel and shrine, which, accompanied by the *Dove*, brought the more fortunate colony from the Clyde to the shores of the Chesapeake.

There is also a beautiful Christian legend associated with the name of Avalon, which Lord Baltimore conferred upon his Newfoundland colony. Avalon was the ancient name of Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, England, where, according to this venerable legend, Joseph of Arimathea landed in England with his missionary companions; here the friend of Jesus received a grant of land from King Arviragus; here he preached the Gospel, he erected the great abbey, which became the most renowned monastic establishment of Britain. Here died and was buried Joseph of Arimathea, the "noble counsellor, and a good and just man; who had waited for the Kingdom of Heaven;" who boldly "begged the body of Jesus" from Pilate, and devoutly buried his crucified Lord in his own new monument in the garden "wherein no man yet had been laid," and who "rolled a great stone to the door of the monument." How many sacred and golden links there are, in the hidden learning of ages, which mystically bind our own America to the Cradle of Christianity; to Calvary; to the Cross; to the Crucified.

But the sacrifices and sufferings of Lord Baltimore in the cause of religious liberty were not yet ended. It was next his intention to settle himself, his family and colony in Virginia. He accordingly arrived with his family and followers at Jamestown on October 1, 1629. His surprise and indignation were great when instead of being welcomed to land and to settle in the "Old Dominion," as was due to a gentleman of distinction and to colonists of the same race and nation with the Virginians, and, as well, calculated to promote the prosperity of the colony, Lord Baltimore and his companions were refused a home in Virginia, unless he and they would take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, whereby he would swear not only temporal allegiance to his King, Charles I., but also swear that the King was the only Supreme Governor,

*"as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes."* He offered to take the oath of allegiance, but he refused to take the oath of supremacy to the temporal prince, as long as his conscience held him to render allegiance "in all thing spiritual and ecclesiastical" alone to the Vicar of Christ. Refused permission to remain or a home on the soil of Virginia, he was ordered to embark on the first ship for England, and Mr. Scharf, in his "History of Maryland," says he must have been treated rather rudely, "for we find . . . a record of March 25, 1630 (O. S.), which reads: 'Thomas Tindall to be pilloried two hours for giving my Lord Baltimore the lie and threatening to knock him down.'" But he was compelled to take passage for England in the first ship, and to leave his wife and children in Virginia. He afterwards sent for them, "but unfortunately," as is related in old chronicles and in recent histories, "the bark on its return voyage was cast away, and they were all lost, together with 'a great deal of plate and other goods of great value.'" After the expenditure of so much wealth and labor in the effort to plant his colony in freedom, security and peace, for it is known that he provided munificently for every want of the colony at Avalon, and the loss of all dear to him, except his three sons, Cecil, Leonard and George, well did Lord Baltimore write to his friend the Earl of Stafford, in 1631, "I have been for so long a time a man of sorrows."

It was during this period of Lord Baltimore's struggles and sacrifices for religious liberty that Roger Williams was still in England, graduated at Pembroke College, is said to have studied law, and if so, no doubt, under the patronage of Lord Coke; and it is certain that he was a clergyman of the Church of England, and as such secure from that bloody code of penal laws which drove Lord Baltimore's Catholic colonists from England and the gallows to Avalon in search of religious liberty, while it fostered and supported the English establishment. Avalon was the germ of Maryland.

Lord Baltimore now turned his hopes of an American settlement, for the freedom of conscience, to the land of Mary, and obtained from King Charles the proprietary grant of that province and the famous Charter of Maryland. The Charter of Avalon, granted by King James I., was dated on April 7, 1623, while that of Maryland, granted by Charles I. to George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, was prepared; but in consequence of his death on April 15, 1632, was not signed and sealed. But it was issued to his son and heir, Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, published and confirmed, on June 20, 1632.

While countless historical testimonials could be quoted to show the exalted character of George Calvert, and his purposes in favor

of religious liberty, we will confine ourselves to a passage from the first and best edition of Bancroft's "History of the United States:" "Calvert deserved to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent law-givers of all ages. He was *the first* in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice, and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of liberty of conscience; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects. The asylum of Papists was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on banks of rivers which, as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the state."

The Maryland charter, like that of Avalon, was prepared by Lord Baltimore. His advisers and assistants in this noble work of statesmanship were the English Catholic noblemen, the Earl of Arundel, Father Blount, provincial of the Society of Jesus in England, the Duke of Norfolk, and Lord Howard. Father Blount resigned the office of provincial in 1635 and was succeeded by Father Henry More, the great-grandson of Sir Thomas More, who was the Lord High Chancellor of England in the time of Henry VIII., the successor of Cardinal Wolsey in that office, the first layman to hold that office, and of whom the Protestant General Bradley T. Johnson, in "The Foundation of Maryland," says: "Illustrious for learning, piety, and patriotism, who had sealed with his blood his attachment to the old faith, and his defence of the rights of conscience." Lord Baltimore, the first and second, also consulted the General of the Jesuits, Father Mutius Vitelleschi. All these illustrious noblemen and Jesuits approved the charter and defended it against all objections.

Of this charter, the work of Catholic statesmen and Jesuits, General Johnson, a Protestant, says: "Instead of founding a Roman Catholic colony, as the Puritans had founded a Puritan colony in New England, it became apparent to his (Lord Baltimore's) wise mind that to secure any liberty at all, he must secure it by the safeguards which experience had proved had protected it for so many centuries in England, and that to make these safeguards more efficient than they had been in England, they must be extended to all, the title of all men to the rights of person, of property and of thought. He therefore determined to invite all men, of all Christian people, to emigrate to the new colony, under the conditions of the charter." Father Blount, in defending the charter, speaks of it as a "License for them to depart this Kingdom and go into Maryland, or any Country, where they may have free liberty of their Religion." And General Johnson, in speaking of

Father Blount's defence of the charter, says: "This paper proves that the Charter of Maryland was then considered and treated as securing liberty of conscience to Roman Catholics. It proves further that the Society of Jesus undertook to further and extend the planting of the colony, *with the full knowledge that the principle of religious toleration was to be adopted as one of the fundamental institutions of the Province, and toleration for Roman Catholics carried with it, of necessity, toleration for all Christians.*" George Bancroft, speaking of the charter prepared by Lord Baltimore for Maryland, says: "Representative government was indissolubly connected with the fundamental charter. . . . For the benefit of the colony, the restraining statutes were dispensed with; and, *at the appointment of the Baron of Baltimore, all present and future liege people of the English King, except such as should be expressly forbidden*" (and none were forbidden), "*might freely transport themselves and their families to Maryland. Christianity was by the charter made the law of the land, but no preference was given to any Sect, and equality of religious rights, not less than civil freedom, was assured.*" And the same author says that Cecilius, the second Lord Baltimore, "was the heir of his *father's intentions* no less than of his father's fortunes."

Cecilius, Lord Baltimore, now proceeded to organize, provide for and dispatch his colony for the new world. The time first set for their departure was September, 1633, but it was on the 22d of November when they sailed from Cowes. The bigotry of English laws and officials seemed intent on preventing these seeking after liberty of conscience from escaping the penalties of the persecuting laws of their native country, or from reaching the new home beyond the Atlantic, where peace and liberty awaited their coming. Oaths of allegiance and other preventive means delayed their final departure.

The lord proprietary defrayed from his own private means the entire expense of the first expedition. The two vessels that brought on the colonists were the *Ark* and the *Dove*. "These names," says Mr. Scharf, in his "History of Maryland," "were doubtless, of Calvert's conferring, and symbolized his aims and hopes; for these ships bore religious freedom and the olive branch of peace to the new world."

Such were the conditions and proposals to colonists, that land was offered before their departure from England, in 1633, and actually given after the arrival and settlement in Maryland, in 1634, to colonists without distinction of creed; and the people came without distinction of religion. For although the leaders, rulers, freemen and gentlemen of the expedition were Catholics, they were not the entire colony; the servants and others forming

the colony made a numerical majority of Protestants. The Catholic majority of freemen held the control in their hands, but all were invited, and all received offers and gifts of lands without distinction. That these terms were announced to all and embraced is clearly shown by the sequel.

In the very first year of its existence the Maryland colony was plunged in actual war by the lawless usurpations of Ingle and Clayborne, leaders of a colony of Protestants, who had, without lawful authority or title, settled themselves on Kent Island. Bozman, a Protestant historian most hostile to Lord Baltimore, says ; " In this situation of constant danger from the savages, and actual warfare with their own countrymen (Clayborne's party), it could not be expected that the colonists had as yet, in little more than a year from their first landing, extended their settlements beyond their small town of St. Mary's. The lord proprietary, however, had not forgotten to make arrangements for a more dispersed occupation of the country. There is strong evidence to presume that written propositions or ' conditions ' upon which the colonists were to emigrate, had been propounded to them *before their departure* from England." These are now found among the recently published Calvert papers by Mr. Brown.

The following official document, containing the instructions of Lord Baltimore to his brother, Lieutenant-Governor Leonard Calvert and the Commissioners, as to the manner in which they were to treat the Protestants on board the *Ark* and *Dove* in the first voyage that brought out the colony from England to America, is important on the question of priority of toleration between Maryland and Rhode Island, especially since a claim of priority has been made for Rhode Island. This document is dated on November 13, 1633, and in such a question of priority, we might ask whether the year 1633 or the year 1636 came first. The instructions of Lord Baltimore on this point read as follows :

" I. Impri : His lopp (lordship), requires his said Governor and Commissioners that in their voyage to Maryland they be very careful to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers on shipp board, and that they suffer no scandal or offence to be given to any of the Protestants, whereby any just complaint may hereafter be made by them, in Virginia or in England, and for that end they cause all acts of Roman Catholique Religion to be done as privately as may be, and that they instruct all the Roman Catholiques to be silent upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of religion, and that the said Governor and Commissioners treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit. And this is to be observed at land as well as at Sea." Brown's " George and Cecelius Calvert," p. 46-7 ; or " Calvert Papers."

The colony was under the command of Leonard Calvert, a brother of Lord Cecilus, who was appointed governor, and the Catholics were accompanied by three Jesuit missionaries, Fathers Andrew White, John Althan and Thomas Copley. The Protestants did not then, nor for some time afterwards, avail themselves of the right conceded to them of bringing a minister of their faith with them. From the beginning each church was to support its own ministers. The only aid the Jesuits received from the proprietary government were the lands which, as freemen of the province, they took up, in common with the other colonists. They were not allowed, as no one was, to acquire lands from the Indians. The colonists landed and laid the foundations of St. Mary's in March, 1634; they immediately shared the spot with the Indians, received as a gift from them a small wigwam, which was used as a Catholic chapel; the erection of a little fort was an unnecessary precaution, as the Indians shared everything with the new comers and embraced their faith.

It was during this period of struggle for religious liberty, 1630–1634, that Roger Williams, leaving the established English Church, became a Puritan; he joined the extreme wing of that sect, whose views, leaning strongly towards those of the Baptists, tended greatly to the spread of the latter sect in England. He joined the Puritan colony of Massachusetts, and arrived at Boston on February 5, 1631. From Boston he went to Salem, where he was the assistant of the Puritan Pastor Skelton, and not long afterwards he became the assistant of Pastor Ralph Smith at Plymouth, where he remained two years. He was next invited to return to Salem to become the assistant and afterwards the successor of Pastor Skelton, and he remained probably at Salem until 1635.

Far from wishing to detract from Roger Williams's struggles and sufferings in behalf of the rights of conscience, we wish to make the most ample and just acknowledgment of them. We reproduce here his sentence of banishment from Massachusetts, as given in Arnold's "History of Rhode Island."

"Whereas, Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the Church of Salem, both broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates; as also writ letters of defamation both of the magistrate and churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without any retraction; it is therefore ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction not to return any more without license from the court."

As an act of pretended clemency the magistrates offered to allow



Roger Williams to remain till the spring of 1636, for the decree against him was passed in the 'all of 1635, provided he would dissemble his views. He honorably refused to do this. It had become known that he proposed founding a colony at Narragansett, based upon the very views for which he had been struggling and for which he was banished, so that it was determined to send him to England at once, and a small vessel was sent to Salem to carry him into banishment across the ocean. Being forewarned he made his escape from Salem into the wilderness, but he fell in with some friendly Indians. Mr. Arnold says of the views and sentiments insisted on by Roger Williams and for which he was persecuted, that, "In reviewing the measures which led to the banishment of Roger Williams we find that they all proceeded from the firmness with which on every occasion he maintained the doctrine that the civil power had no control over the religious opinions of men." But we cannot agree with Mr. Arnold when he identifies this doctrine with the right of private judgment. His sojourn among the Indians, on thus being driven away from his friends and family, he himself described, as "sorely tossed for fourteen weeks, not knowing what bread or bed did mean."

He announced the fundamental basis of his commonwealth as follows: "I having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the satchems and nations round about us, and having, of a sense of God's merciful providence unto me in my distress, called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience."

In the meantime and while Roger Williams was in England, Lord Baltimore, who, ever since his conversion in 1624, had struggled for the establishment of a State founded on the principle of liberty of conscience, had finally succeeded in carrying his beneficent purpose into effect on obtaining the Maryland charter in 1632, which his son Cecilius put into actual execution as soon as the Governor, Leonard Calvert, and the colonists embarked for Maryland in November, 1633, and which began to bear its first benign fruits on the landing at St. Mary's in March, 1634, and previously on the voyage itself, as we have seen.

From the latter date, 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded, religious liberty and freedom of conscience prevailed in Maryland under the instructions and avowed purpose of Lord Baltimore, and it became the established custom and practice, the common law of the province then and thenceforth and without interruption, until the official oath of 1648, and especially the celebrated act of Toleration of 1649, caused the custom and common law to become the statute law of the colony. Authorities without number could be cited in proof of the fact that, while we

can afford to leave out the period of effort on the part of Lord Baltimore between 1624 and 1634, ten years, while Roger Williams was an Episcopalian in England or a Puritan in Massachusetts, the period of actual religious liberty of conscience and religious freedom under the exalted administration of Lord Baltimore and his Lieutenant Governor, Leonard Calvert, from 1634 to 1636, shows that the Calverts and Maryland have a priority of two years over Roger Williams and Rhode Island.

In Lodge's "History of the English Colonies in America" (Protestant) we read: "*Yet there can be no doubt of the fact of religious toleration in Maryland at the very outset.* Where was Rhode Island then?

What could be clearer in principle or more explicit in statement of fact than the following passage from Scharf's "History of Maryland?" "As we have already shown, the evidence leads to the conclusion that the colony, though containing many non-Catholics, was a Roman Catholic settlement originally, and so continued until 1649, when the great Toleration Act was passed. *But this act introduced no new principle nor policy into the government of the colony; it was but the legislative sanction and declaration of a principle and policy practiced from the beginning.* And these facts that Maryland thus took the lead in religious freedom and was the *first community* in modern times in which the civil was effectually separated from the ecclesiastical power, not only do honor to its founders, but are of deep importance in the history of the world." . . . "The early writers on Maryland history confirm our views, not argumentatively, but as *facts* undenied and unquestioned."

Wynne (Protestant), in his history of America, published in London in 1776, expressly states that Calvert's motive was *from the beginning* to find religious liberty in a settlement of his own founding, and that he desired and took measures to extend the same to all others. "His lordship (Sir George Calvert) was a Catholic and had formed his design of making this settlement in order to enjoy a liberty of conscience which, though the government of England was by no means disposed to deny, yet the rigor of the laws threatened in a great measure to deprive him, the severity of which it was not in the power of the court to relax. This settlement of the colony cost Lord Baltimore a large sum. It was made under his auspices, by his brother and about 200 persons, Roman Catholics, most of them of good families." (More recent research tends to show that while the leaders and controllers of the settlement were Catholics, the servants and others of humbler rank were Protestants and were numerically in the majority; but as they were not freeholders or freemen, they had no part in the government at first.) "No people," says Wynne,

" could live in greater ease and security, and his lordship, *willing that as many as possible should enjoy the benefits of his mild and equitable administration*, gave his consent to an act of assembly, *which he had before promoted in his province*, for allowing a free and unlimited toleration to all who professed the Christian religion of whatever denominations. *This liberty, which was never in the least violated*, encouraged a great number, not only of the Church of England, of Presbyterians, Quakers, and all kinds of dissenters, to settle in Maryland, which, before that time, was almost wholly in the hands of Roman Catholics." This last statement refers and is true only as to the governing class, who were at first all Catholics.

In 1751 and 1758, when under Protestant domination, the upper house of the Maryland Legislature insisted that the unjust double tax should be removed from the shoulders of Catholics, alleging as a ground therefor the fact that under Catholic sway *the foundations* of the Commonwealth had been laid upon the principle of religious liberty and equality. The lower house denied this fact, whereupon the upper house, after quoting the history of the colony under Calvert and the charter, answered the lower house as follows, both houses being composed entirely of Protestants: " After the charter was thus granted to Lord Baltimore, who was then a Roman Catholic, his lordship *emitted his proclamation to encourage the settlement of his province, promising therein among other things, liberty of conscience and an equal exercise of religion to every denomination of Christians who would transport themselves and reside in his province, and that he would procure a law to be passed for that purpose afterwards.*"

So, also, the following passage in Governor Sharpe's MS. letter-book, December 15, 1758, contains the additional official avowal that the Catholics of Maryland proclaimed and practiced religious toleration from *their first landing in 1634*. " It might, perhaps, be unknown, if not to the authors, at least to some of the propagators of the above mentioned report, that the people *who first settled in this province were Roman Catholics, and that, although every other sect was tolerated*, a majority of the inhabitants continued Papists till the revolution (1688), soon after which event an act was made here for the support of a clergyman of the Church of England in every parish, which is still in force (1758); and the Papists as well as Protestants are thereby obliged to pay annually very considerable sums for that purpose." " Upon the whole, my lord, I must say that, if I was asked whether the conduct of the Protestants or Papists in the province has been most unexceptionable since I have had the honor to serve your lordship, I should not hesitate to give an answer in favor of the latter."

General Bradley T. Johnson, another Protestant writer, who had

made an exhaustive investigation of this question in his "Foundation of Maryland," bears the strongest testimony to the same end throughout his learned work. "His (Lord Baltimore's) object," he writes, "was not only to secure a refuge for persecuted Roman Catholics, hounded from every hundred in the three kingdoms, where they might enjoy their religion in peace, but the larger and nobler one, that a great State should grow up, where the rights, franchises and liberties of Englishmen, freedom of person, security of property and *liberty of conscience*, the right to habeas corpus and trial by jury, to be taxed only by themselves, and to be unmolested in their homes and their families, should be secured and guaranteed to *all* its people forever." And again he writes: "Instead, then, of the foundations of Maryland having been laid on a policy of colonization and material development, or as the consequence of religious movement in England, or as the result of the teachings and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, the light now shed upon the contemporaneous actors, their motives and their acts, enables us to see that Lord Baltimore, *from the very initiation of his enterprise*, deliberately, maturely and wisely, upon consultation and advice, determined to devote his life and fortune to the work of founding a free English State, with its institutions deeply *planted* upon the ancient customs, rights and safeguards of free Englishmen, *and which should be a sanctuary for all Christian people forever.*" . . . "He therefore determined to invite *all men, of all Christian people, to emigrate to the new colony, under the conditions of the charter.*"

In this noble work Lord Baltimore was advised and sustained by the Jesuits of England, through the Provincials, Fathers More and Blount, but also by the whole Society of Jesus through its General at Rome. In August, 1636, Lord Baltimore issued again his Conditions of Plantation, no copies of the proclamations upon which he induced colonists to join him in England being now extant, where he repeated the original conditions, and not only gave lands to colonists without regard to their sectarian preferences, but also confirmed the lands which, under his previous proclamations, people of every sect had enjoyed from the *beginning* of the colony, in 1634, and therein he specially mentioned the lands thus granted in the previous years 1634 and 1635.

General Bradley T. Johnson, who has thus written so nobly in defense of the prior claim of our Catholic ancestors, as the first to proclaim religious liberty in the new world, though a Protestant, is the same distinguished citizen of Maryland who recently presented to His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, a casket made of the wood of the "Old Mulberry Tree," at St. Mary's, under whose branches, in 1634, the first Mass was celebrated and the first offi-

cial announcement in Maryland was made, that the *basis* of the new Commonwealth was civil and religious liberty. Mr. Bancroft, again speaking of the landing of the Maryland Catholic Pilgrims at St. Mary's, says: "So that, upon the twenty-seventh of March (1634), the Catholics took quiet possession of the little place; and *religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world*, at the humble village which bore the name of St. Mary's." This again was in 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded.

The first edition of Bancroft's "History of the United States" was published in 1854; the centennial or "The Author's Last Revision," was published in 1883. But even yet, in his last edition or revision, so much less favorable to Catholics than the first, there is enough of the truth left in the chapter on Maryland to refute the claim made in behalf of Roger Williams and Rhode Island as entitled to the credit of first founding a State on the basis of religious liberty. In the first place Bancroft cannot, in this mutilated edition, refrain from admitting that "Sir George Calvert deserves to be ranked among the wisest and most benevolent law-givers, for he connected his hopes of the aggrandizement of his family with the establishment of popular institutions; and being a 'papist wanted not charity toward Protestants.'"

But now we will quote a passage from this very edition of Bancroft in which he declares that religious liberty and freedom of conscience did not spring, as has been supposed by some, from the official oath devised in 1648, but that religious liberty and freedom of conscience existed and were practiced and guaranteed to all sects long before that year, and in fact from the first arrival and foundation of the Maryland colony, in 1634, two years before Roger Williams devised his compact for the inhabitants of Providence, Rhode Island, by which they bound themselves "to be obedient to the orders of the majority *only in civil things*." The judgment of this historian especially, when expressed in his anti-Catholic edition of his *history*, ought to be conclusive on the subject of priority between Maryland and Rhode Island.

Now here is what Bancroft, referring to the years 1634-1635, says: "No sufferings were endured; no fears of want arose; the *foundations* of Maryland were peacefully and happily laid; and in six months it advanced more than Virginia had done in as many years. The proprietary continued with great liberality to provide everything needed for its comfort and protection, expending twenty thousand pounds sterling, and his associates as many more. *But far more memorable was the character of its institutions*. One of the largest wigwags was consecrated for religious service by the Jesuits, who could therefore say that the first chapel

of Maryland was built by the red men. *Of the Protestants, though they seem as yet to have been without a minister, their rights were not abridged. This enjoyment of liberty of conscience DID NOT SPRING FROM ANY ACT OF COLONIAL LEGISLATION, nor from any formal or general edict of the governor, nor from any OATH as yet imposed by instructions of the proprietary. English statutes were not held to bind the colonies, unless they especially named them; the clause which, in the charter for Virginia, excluded from that colony 'all persons suspected to affect the superstitions of the Church of Rome,' found no place in the charter for Maryland; and while allegiance was held to be due, there was no requirement of the oath of supremacy. TOLERATION GREW UP IN THE PROVINCE SILENTLY AS THE CUSTOM OF THE LAND. Through the benignity of the administration, no person professing to believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ was permitted to be molested on account of religion. Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find an asylum on the north bank of the Potomac; and there, too, Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance. From the first, men of foreign birth enjoyed equal advantages with those of the Eng'lish and Irish nations."*

This unquestionable authority shows that Maryland and Calvert were at the least two years prior to Rhode Island and Roger Williams in promising and practicing liberty of conscience. But following the first edition of Bancroft, fixing Roger Williams's compact in 1636, Lord Baltimore having planned his colony as a home for religious liberty at his conversion, 1624, Calvert was twelve years prior to Roger Williams. The charter of Avalon was dated on April 7, 1623, which was thirteen years prior to the foundation of Rhode Island, for Lord Baltimore, the year before his conversion, and in anticipation of it, planned the free settlement of Avalon. In 1632 the Maryland charter was granted, and this was four years before Rhode Island was founded by Roger Williams; and in 1633 the colony was organized, grants of land promised to settlers without distinction of creed, and the embarkation and departure from England took place, which was three years before Rhode Island was founded. The actual landing of the Maryland pilgrims at St. Mary's in 1634 gives Maryland and Calvert two years' precedence in establishing religious liberty over Rhode Island and Roger Williams. The instructions issued by Lord Baltimore in 1633 for the voyage which we have quoted, makes the priority three years. But the Maryland charter, 1632, makes the priority four years. We cannot better conclude this paper than by presenting three eminent authorities, all Protestant, in favor of the prior claim of Maryland—an historian, an annalist, and a jurist—Bancroft, Chalmers, and Judge Story.

George Bancroft, in his first and best edition of his "History of

the United States," says: "Calvert deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent law-givers of all ages. He was the *first* in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of *liberty of conscience*; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects. The Asylum of Papists was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of rivers which, as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the State."

Chalmers, in his "Annals," adds his testimony to that of Bancroft. "He (Lord Baltimore) *laid the foundation* of his province upon the broad basis of security to property and of *freedom of religion*, granting, in absolute fee, fifty acres of land to *every* emigrant; establishing Christianity according to the old common law, of which it is a part, without allowing pre-eminence to any particular sect. The wisdom of his choice soon converted a dreary wilderness into a prosperous colony."

Mr. Justice Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution," said: "It is certainly very honorable to the liberality and public spirit of the proprietary that he should have introduced into his fundamental policy the doctrine of general toleration and equality among Christian sects (for he does not appear to have gone further), and have thus given the earliest example of a legislator inviting his subjects to the free indulgence of religious opinion. This was anterior to the settlement of Rhode Island, and therefore merits the enviable rank of being the first recognition among the colonists of the glorious and indefeasible rights of conscience."

RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D.

---

## THE VICAR-GENERAL.

### ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF THIS OFFICE.

- I.—**Meaning of the word "vicar."**—The office of vicar-general equivalently fulfilled either by the "chorepiscopi" or by priests in whom the bishops had put their trust.—First authentic trace of this institution in an exceptional disposition of the IV. Council of Lateran.—The archdeacons are definitively supplanted by the vicars-general during the thirteenth century.—Extension of the vicar-general's jurisdiction.—Voluntary and contentious jurisdiction.
- II.—**The cathedral chapter** has, during a certain time, held a part with the bishop in the choice of the vicar-general.—The bishop alone choosing nowadays.—Is he obliged to have a vicar?—In certain cases Rome appoints immediately the vicar-general.—Although there is no precise obligation, nevertheless the use is universal.
- III.—**About the plurality of vicars-general.**—Abuses of the "ancien regime."—The prelates, high lords and their staff.—Ambition of the young clergymen of noble birth.—The bishops disdained the advice of their chapter and had a counsel of vicars.—How Richelieu received the remarks of his vicars.—Plurality of vicars-general in certain countries to-day.—Legitimacy of that custom.—A bishop could not be obliged to have more than one vicar.—Powers of the co-vicars.
- IV.—**Mode of nomination.**

**THE** general sense attached to the word "vicar" is admirably explained by the learned Jesuit Leurenus in his scholarly treatise, "*De Episcoporum Vicariis*." By vicars are understood those who are legitimately appointed as vicegerents of an ecclesiastical superior with power to exercise the ministry or the jurisdiction in his name. "*Vicarii dicuntur qui legitima auctoritate constituti sunt, ut episcopi alteriusve praelati, parochi, aut clerici, vices gerant in divinis ministeriis aut jurisdictione exercenda.*"<sup>1</sup> In fact, every one at the head of an important administration has need of a trustworthy substitute or vicar who can help him in the daily press of business and even replace him altogether in sickness or when absent.

Formerly the chorepiscopi (rural bishops) appear to have fulfilled duties something similar to our modern vicars-general; but it would be an historical absurdity to ascribe, as some authors

<sup>1</sup> Leurenus, *De Episcoporum Vicariis*, cap. i., p. 2.



have done, the same origin to both or to see in the office of the vicar-general a mere evolution of the office of the chorepiscopus. In former times bishops often selected clerics with whom they shared the task of administering their dioceses. Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzus<sup>1</sup> was prevailed upon by the solicitation of his venerable father, then bishop of Nazianzus, to leave the quiet retreat to which he had retired to perfect himself in sanctity, and become his assistant in the administration of the diocese. In the same way was St. Basil induced by Eusebius of Cæsarea<sup>2</sup> to render a like service to the Church. These were to a certain extent the prototypes of our modern vicars-general, as we now understand the term—a similarity which Thomassin very aptly notices in the comparison he establishes between these two saintly persons.<sup>3</sup>

These examples, taken from the Eastern Church, are by no means exceptions. St. Ambrose was aided in the administration of his extensive diocese of Milan by a Roman priest, Simplicius, who was sent by Pope St. Damasus, and who afterwards succeeded to the See of Milan. The relations of St. Augustine of Hippo with the Bishop Valerius<sup>4</sup> are well known, and important traces of an institution now become universal. We do not pretend to see in these examples a proof of any general discipline on the point or to maintain that canon law had then either traced its duties or fixed its obligations.<sup>5</sup> Besides being historically inaccurate, this would be neglecting to take into account the very important factors which played no uncertain part in shaping and moulding ecclesiastical law in this matter. Moreover, facts are opposed to such a theory. The decree of Gratian, as it is well known, never even refers to the vicar-general.<sup>6</sup> The decretals have

<sup>1</sup> Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, ad. an. 371, No. 101. Nata. Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.*, sæc. iv., diss. xix., prop. iii., p. 401.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. Naz., in Oratione xliii.; in laudam Basilii. Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, t. xxxvi., No. 790, 792. Baron., ad. au. 369, No. 45.

<sup>3</sup> "Magna inter utrumque, hunc Cæsareæ, illum Nazianzi generalem Vicarium affinitas, magna virtutum cognatio: cum enim esset uterque tum voluntariæ, tum contentiosæ administer jurisdictionis, episcopalem curam et laborem in se suscipiebant omnium."—Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. Discip.*, p. i., lib. ii., cap. vi., No. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Possidius, *Vita S. August.*, cap. iv. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, t. xxxii., p. 38

<sup>5</sup> "Fassen wir indessen die Stellung dieser Männer zu ihren Bischöfen nahe ins Auge, so wird sich leicht ergeben dass sie nur uneigentlich und in weitesten sinne des Wortes Generalvicare genannt werden können.—Kober, *Ueber den Ursprung und die Rechtliche Stellung der Generalvicare. Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1853, p. 536.

<sup>6</sup> The first allusion to officials of this kind appears in a letter of Innocent II., July 23, 1137. This Pope authorized the Bishop of Paris to delegate certain priests to help him in the discharge of his duties. He permitted these clerics to enjoy their benefices without being compelled to residence. We do not find any record of the title of vicar general being taken by these ecclesiastics before the beginning of the fourteenth century.—Cf. Guérard, *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Paris*, tom. i., pref. p. 108; tom. iii., 3, 123, 184; tom. ix., 54, 83, 196.

special articles treating of archpriests and archdeacons, an article on the functions of the vicar, "*De Officio Vicarii*;" but in all this there is no question of the clearly defined matter which now occupies us;<sup>1</sup> although commentators treat about vicars-general under this rubric, "*De Officio Vicarii*." The first trace of this office appears in a wise dispensation of the Fourth Council of Lateran, intended to prevent or check in a diocese difficulties arising from the commingling of the faithful of different nationalities or of different languages.

Moved at the sight of so many race differences, the fathers assembled in the Lateran palace under the presidentship of Innocent III., determined to remedy the existing evils by the appointment of secondary or inferior administrators, who, while representing the bishop of the diocese and vested with his authority, should accomplish in his name and with his sanction the good which the bishop, alone and unaided, could not do. We give this important text in full, as it merits the attention both of the canonist and of the historian, on account of the part it played later on in the special legislation we are now considering: "*Quoniam in plerisque partibus infra eandem civitatem atque diocesim permixti sunt populi diversarum linguarum habentes sub una fide varios ritus et mores, districtè præcipimus, ut pontifices hujusmodi civitatum sive diocesum, provideant viros idoneos, qui secum diversitates rituum et linguarum divina illis officia celebrent et ecclesiastica sacramenta ministrent instruendo verbo pariter et exemplo.*"<sup>2</sup>

Having settled this important point and duly provided for the daily administration of the sacraments and the ministry of the Word, the council next turned its attention to those possible conflicts and natural disagreements ever inseparable from the government of men, and added, so as to secure unity of direction and to prevent the formation of a double centre of authority in the same diocese, the vicar-general's duty of absolute obedience and subjection to the bishop: "*Si . . . urgens necessitas postulaverit, pontifex loci Catholicum præsulem nationibus illis, conformem providâ deliberatione constituat sibi vicarium in prædictis, qui ei per omnia sit obediens et subjectus.*"<sup>3</sup>

And here we may remark that there is question in the present instance of a necessity which cannot be satisfactorily met otherwise.<sup>4</sup> Later on this necessity will always be taken for granted, even when the needs which gave rise to it will exist no longer.

<sup>1</sup> Chap. "*Sub Nobis*" 5, title xxiii., lib. i., *Decret.*

<sup>2</sup> Cap. *Quoniam*, 14 tit. xxi., *De Officio Judicis Ordinarii*, lib. i., *Decret.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The bishops who were most exposed in administrative affairs had already, as we have seen, called to their assistance able and devoted co-operators. Leurenus, *loc. cit.*, p. 4, No. 59, mentions some later examples equally well known. "*Erant tamen tunc in nonnullis diocesisibus vicarii-generales episcoporum quemadmodum Gildui-*

The idea, however, of dependence and obedience to the bishop will ever remain unchanged and fundamental. The vicar-general is to form *one and the same person with the bishop*, and to act in perfect harmony with him. These two leading ideas appear to have moulded the whole legislation in reference to the office of the vicar-general. Long before this, the archdeacons exercised a similar duty near the bishop, but by degrees, owing to the negligence of superiors, or the action of various agencies<sup>1</sup> still unknown to us, the office of archdeacon assumed everywhere an overweening importance, and soon outgrew its usefulness,<sup>2</sup> and what was at first a simple delegation, depending entirely on the will of the bishop both for existence and for authority, became before long a regular title and benefice, from which there was no removal. To destroy this novel monopoly, a ready remedy was to create a rival authority to the archdeacons—an authority more pliable because revocable,<sup>3</sup> more powerful, because identical with the bishop's own authority, and exercised by one having the constant and immediate confidence of the ordinary. In this way the archdeacon was allowed to retain his official dignity, but he was gradually removed to a distance from the bishop. There his titles and his powers grew practically useless, and being so, they soon disappeared altogether.<sup>4</sup> The title *de officio vicarii* in 6<sup>o</sup>,<sup>5</sup> gives us an insight into

num Abbatem S. Victoris apud Parisios fuisse Vicarium Generalem Episcopi testatur Thomass. Item abbatem monasterii canonicorum Praemonstratensium ex antiquo usu esse Vicarium Episcopi Virdunensis."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Isid. Hispa., *Epistol. ad Luitfred*, cap. i., § iii., dis. xxx. *Conci. Cabillon* ii., anno 813, cap. xv. Labbe, *Coll. Conc.*, t. xiv., p. 96. Hincm. Rhem., *Capit. Archid. data*, Migne, P. L., t. cxxv., p. 799, *et s.*

<sup>2</sup> St. Bernard refers to them in these very significant terms. "Sic sublimatum honoribus Ecclesiasticis, ut nec Episcopis inferior videatur, sic implicatum militaribus officiis ut praeferatur et ducibus."—*Epist.* 78, P. L. t. clxxxii., p. 198, No. 11. Fulbert of Chartres is not less severe in speaking of his archdeacon. "Cum deberet esse oculus Episcopi sui, dispensator pauperum, catechisator insipientium apostavit ab omnibus et factus est quasi clavus in oculum, praedo pauperibus, dux erroris insipientibus, quinimo superba et contumeliosa dicta in Episcopum suum jaculatus est.—Fulb. Carnot. ad clerum Paris et 97, P. L. t. cxli., p. 248. M. Achille Luchaire in his learned *Manuel des Institutions Francaises*, gives expression to his opinion in the following terms: "The abuse of the archdeacon's powers soon brought about a series of troubles which agitated nearly every diocese. The archdeacon was in almost continual conflict (1) with the parishes and priories concerning the right of inspection and procuration; (2) with the cathedral chapters about the administration of vacant sees; (3) but especially was he at variance with the bishop, whose jurisdiction he called in question on every possible occasion, and diminished in every conceivable way."

<sup>3</sup> "Unde si quis aliter se ingesserit excommunicationis se noverit mucrone percussus, et si nec sic respuerit ab omni ministerio Ecclesiastico deponendum, adhibito si necesse fuerit, brachio seculari ad tantam insolentiam repellendam."—*Cit. Cap.*, Quoniam.

<sup>4</sup> "Es ist eins der Mittel Gewesen, welches, dazu gedient hat die Macht der Archidiaconen zu brechen."—Hinschius *Das Kirckenrecht*, t. ii., p. 205. Kober, *loc. cit.*, p. 537.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Thomass., *Vetus et nova Ecclesiae. Disci.*, p. i., lib. ii., cap. viii., *seq.*—P. Fourquier, *Les Officialites au moyen age*, *passim*.

this quiet struggle, whose certain result is clearly indicated by the unflinching methods employed.

In the thirteenth century the contest was over, and the victory secure;<sup>1</sup> the dreaded power of the archdeacon was a thing of the past; the office of the vicar-general was clearly defined, and an admitted fact in the entire Church.<sup>2</sup>

Ferraris gives us an exact and close-fitting definition of the vicar-general as these conditions have made him. "Vicarii-generalis nomine," he tells us, "intelligitur ille qui constitutus est ab Episcopo cum generali potestate, ut ejus vices gerat in eodem loco in quo ipse sedem habet, ac jus dicere solet, ita ut censeatur idem esse auditorium utriusque."<sup>3</sup>

The vicar-general's ordinary jurisdiction extends, like the bishop's own (*a*) to the whole diocese.<sup>4</sup> Were it not so, he would be nothing more than a vicar forane, or rural dean, as Cardinal de Luca,<sup>5</sup> and the Archidæacon de Condom, Ducasse,<sup>6</sup> rightly remark; (*b*) to all cases of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, although a few special reservations may be made to the bishop, and so withdrawn from the vicar-general's jurisdiction.<sup>7</sup>

A bishop may, if he pleases, appoint two vicars, giving to one charge of the spiritual, and to the other charge of the material interests of the diocese. Although each one has unlimited jurisdiction in his own sphere of action, still custom and the traditions of the curia allow the first only to be called vicar-general, while the second is called *œconomus*. Unless the contrary be clearly stated, by vicar is meant *vicarius in spiritualibus*.<sup>8</sup>

Gradually, and at different epochs, a distinction, sanctioned by custom, began to be made between the vicar-general entrusted

<sup>1</sup> In 1298 Boniface VIII. published the liber vi., and reserved in it a special title to the vicar-general.

<sup>2</sup> "Zu Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts ist es als Regel anzusehen, dass jeder Bischof mittelst ausdrücklicher Vollmacht an seinem Bischofssitz einen Vertreter zur Ausübung der Jurisdiction bestellt, der, im Gegensatz zum Archidiacon mit ihm ein Tribunal bildet."—H. Laemmer, *Institutionen des katholischen kirchenrechts*, p. 264.

<sup>3</sup> Ferraris, *Prompt. Biblio.* voce *Vicarius*.

<sup>4</sup> Pirrhing, *loc. cit.*, No. 7.—Laym. ad. c. *Romana de officio Vicarii* in sexto.

<sup>5</sup> "Etiam si ii qui in ipsa civitate deputantur foranei, vel speciales delegati dicuntur, quamvis generalis titulus, seu nuncupatio cum aliqua etiam delegatione universitatis causarum ei tribuatur, quoniam, erit quidem vicarius foraneus, sed cum aliqua majore prerogativa et jurisdictione quam regulariter hujusmodi vicariis competat."—De Luca, *ad Trident*, dist. ix., No. 5.

<sup>6</sup> "L'évêque communique (au grand vicaire) sa juridiction volontaire et gratuite s'il la lui communique dans toute l'étendue de son diocèse, c'est son Vicaire general; s'il ne la lui communique que dans un certain detroit, c'est son vicaire forain."—Ducasse, *La pratique et la juridiction Ecclesiastique* p. 14.

<sup>7</sup> To remove all grounds of dispute, the letters-patent usually specify the faculties the vicar-general has in the diocese.

<sup>8</sup> Sbrozzi, *Tractatus de officio et potestate Vicarii Episcopi*, l. i., q. 27, No. 1.

with matters pertaining to *voluntary* jurisdiction, and the vicar commonly called "official," entrusted with administering the *contentious* jurisdiction of the bishop. The vicar-general usually exercises this joint jurisdiction in the whole diocese; this is the more common practise, and seems more in harmony with the Council of Trent, which never speaks of episcopal vicars, but only of one<sup>2</sup>—the vicar-general. Later on we shall have occasion to remark how reluctant many bishops were to admit this interpretation, and in consequence they multiplied most *unreasonably* the number of their vicars.

\* \* \* \* \*

According to the decisions of the Fourth Council of Lateran, the choice of the vicar-general rests with the bishop alone.<sup>3</sup> Notwithstanding, it is certain that it was not always so. During some time, the chapters took part in this nomination. Sbrozzi,<sup>4</sup> even in 1606, mentions this point of a primitive discipline. "Vicarius episcopi non sit a solo episcopo, sed cum consensu et auctoritate capituli, et sic ab universitate quae in capitulo et episcopo consistit." Now the contrary practise<sup>5</sup> is in vigor, and the choice rests with the bishop alone, a custom which is universally<sup>6</sup> observed. Hence, Leurenus and Sbrozzi conclude that the vicar-general's jurisdic-

<sup>1</sup> "Sciendum vero est ex cap. ult. h. tit. in 6<sup>o</sup> et ex praxi in aliquibus locis distinctum fuisse Vic. Generalem ab officiali Episcopi, cum illius auctoritas," versaretur in lis quae sunt voluntariae jurisdictioni officialis vero praesse contentiosae et in negotiis forensibus vices Episcopi gereret; atque idem esset, qui olim dicebatur *missus Episcopi*. Cap. ii., De Reg. C. i., *De Fig. et Melaf. Glossa* ad c. ii. v.<sup>o</sup> officialem, *de officio Vic.* in No. 6<sup>o</sup>. Santi, *Praelectiones juris Canon.* tit xxxiii., p. 211, No. 17. Cf. Pragmaticam Episcopatum constituit. (1699) Epis<sup>4</sup>. Vratislav ap. Læmmer, *op cit.*, p. 268, No. 5, and P. Fournier, *Les officialites au Moyen Age*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Bened. xiv., *De Synod. Dioces.* lib. iii. Cap. iii., No. 2, " . . . in aliquibus regionibus . . . praesertim in Gallia, et Belgio, usus obtinuit ut ab officiali (V. G.) distinguatur, et "Vicarius," nuncupetur qui ea exercet quae sunt jurisdictionis voluntariae; "officialis" vero, qui jurisdictioni praest contentiosae . . . apud nos autem unus et idem Episcopi vices in utriusque jurisdictionis exercitio genere consuevit; quod quidem esse juri conformius," etc.

<sup>3</sup> "Haec facultas instituendi Vicarum generalem," as Santi says, *l. c.* p. 212, "primum concessa est Episcopis a Conc. Lat. iv. cujus dispositio refertur in c. 14, de offic. jud. ord. Necessaria autem fuit dispositio juris communis . . . nam agebatur de novo officio instituendo cui generalis jurisdictio committeretur, ac locum et jura quemadmodum ingrederetur illius potestatis, qua Archidiaconus ex juris dispositione fruebatur."

<sup>4</sup> Sbrozzi, lib. ii., Qu. 55, No. 2.

<sup>5</sup> "If by chance the clergy oppose the bishop's choice, and refuse to accept the vicar-general he names, the S. Congregation usually favors the bishop, and obliges the clergy to submit.—*Analecta Juris Pontif.*, 1858, p. 915. Still it was not always so, and some years ago a certain French chapter opposed both vicars-general, and won its cause.

<sup>6</sup> Pirrhing ad tit *de officio Vicarii*, No. 28. Azor, *Instit Moral*, p. ii., lib. iii., Cap. 6. et c. 43 q. 2. Ferraris, *loc. cit.*, p. 571. "Sic approbante praxi et consuetudine universali quae in talibus est servanda."

tion is ordinary, not delegated. "Hodie episcopus non dat jurisdictionem, sed consuetudo cujus autoritate hodiè solus episcopus vicarium facit, et ideò vicarius olim à capitulo et episcopo, et sic ab universitate, et hodiè a consuetudine habet jurisdictionem et sic dicitur habere ordinariam."

Authors do not agree as to the obligation of a bishop to appoint a vicar-general. In many decisions, the Rota openly favored the bishop's liberty of action, so that in theory, at least, this liberty has been advocated.<sup>2</sup> Pignatelli explains this jurisprudence by pointing out the close connection between the duties of the vicar-general and those of the procurator, and as the glossator in chap. ii., "De Proc.," remarks, no matter how different may be the affairs one has to treat, still he is never obliged to employ a procurator;<sup>3</sup> and again, those who, on account of certain special aptitudes, have a determined ecclesiastical charge assigned to them, should give it their personal attention.<sup>4</sup> In practise, however, it seems almost impossible for bishops to disregard the canonical aid which the Church places within their reach. Pirrhing,<sup>5</sup> and several other writers, too numerous to mention here, while denying any legal obligation compelling the bishop to appoint a vicar, or wishing in any way to fetter his liberty of action, distinguish the case in which the bishop is able to discharge all his episcopal duties without assistance, and when he is unable to do so. In the second case alone is he obliged to appoint a vicar-general.

Ducasse, whose name we have already mentioned, says that Fevret and other well-known authorities lay down several cases in which a bishop is bound to appoint a vicar-general. The first<sup>6</sup> is absence from the diocese; secondly, sickness or some other lawful<sup>7</sup> impediment; thirdly,<sup>8</sup> the existence of several dialects in the same diocese, etc.

The Congregation of bishops and regulars occasionally assumes

<sup>1</sup> Leurenus, *l. c.*, 13. We shall have occasion in another paper to examine the nature of this jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup> Pignatelli, tom. 9. Cons. 105. A. No. 4. "Nullo jure cavetur quod Episcopus necessario teneatur habere vicarium juxta veriore et magis communem sententiam. Gonzalez, *Glossemata ad reg.* viii., *Concellaria*, 4, No. 66. "Cum non teneatur habere vicarium seu officialem secundum veriore opinionem quem tenet Rota." Engel ad tit. *de offic. Vic.*, No. 9. "Si Episcopus velit et sufficiat causas per se tractare, non potest cogi ad vicarium constituendum, quia ipsi Episcopo principaliter incumbit jurisdictionis et exercitium ejus. Barbosa, Alleg. 54, No. 125. *Di Officio et potest. Epis* et in libr. i., *Juris Ecc.*, c. 15, No. 16. de Luca *Ann. ad Conc. Trid.*, disc. iv., No. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Pignatelli, *loc. cit.*, No. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Cap. iii., tit. iv., *De Clericis non residentibus*, lib. iii. Decret.; *Trid. Sess.* xxvi., cap. i. *De Reform.* Ferraris, *op. cit.* v. "electio," art. iii., No. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Pirrhing, ad tit. *de Off. Vic.*, No. 28.

<sup>6</sup> Cap. ii., "Postulastis," tit. xxxiv., *De Voto*, lib. iii., Decretal.

<sup>7</sup> Cap. xv., "Inter Cætera," tit. xxxi., *De officio Jud. Ordin.*, l. i., Decr.

<sup>8</sup> Cap. xiv., "Quoniam," *eod. tit.*

the responsibility of imposing a vicar-general on a bishop who is found wanting in either theological knowledge<sup>1</sup> or judicial training, or administrative capacity<sup>2</sup>. This appointment does not give the vicar the title of vicar-apostolic, but if the congregation sees fit, he may continue to bear the name of vicar-general, although in official communications to the Roman tribunals, he should mention his delegation with apostolic faculties.

It is scarcely necessary to add that a vicar-general appointed by the Holy See holds his title and position independently of the ordinary, and in discharge of the special mission with which he is intrusted, he is not subject to episcopal authority.

Again, he cannot resign without the permission of the Congregation, but all his powers expire on the death of the bishop. In this principally is placed the chief difference between him and the vicar-apostolic, whose authority always remains in force until the newly appointed bishop takes actual possession of his see.

Leaving aside this exceptional case, we have to examine the general question and try to find out if it be admissible nowadays for a bishop, even in those small dioceses which have remained so much like the early Christian communities of the primitive church, no matter how highly gifted or talented he may be, no matter how easy he finds it to administer to every need and supply every want of his charge, in a word, is it right for a bishop blessed with health and science, zeal and activity, to dispense with the services of a vicar-general? We do not think it right or justifiable. With much greater reason does this hold good when there is question of the administration of extensive dioceses or flourishing churches whose ever urgent needs and wants claim attention and solicitude as much as their works of zeal require moulding, shaping and directing.<sup>3</sup> It may then be said, without fear of exaggeration, that the liberty given to bishops in the matter of dispensing with vicars-general is purely nominal, and that, in practice, they are always compelled by circumstances to act otherwise.<sup>4</sup> The uniform custom of the episcopacy is a proof and confirmation of this.

The popes, however, never exercised their authority to force

<sup>1</sup> *S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars* in "Una Civitate Castell," 2 April, 1591; "in Mediol," 8 February, 1594.

<sup>2</sup> The *Analecta Juris*, 1858, p. 906, give several examples of this procedure. In some cases the congregation asks the bishop to sign a blank nomination-paper, then over the bishop's signature is inserted the name selected by the congregation, or by the nuncio (or by the apostolic delegate, if there is one in the country), or even by the metropolitan.

<sup>3</sup> "Verum inspectis gravibus negotiis quæ persolvere debet episcopus, et variis occupationibus ministerii sacri quibus distrahitur, dici potest juxta sensum Cap. 15, *de off. et potes. Jud. Ord.*, illum generaliter teneri." Santi, *op. cit.*, tom. i, p. 212.

<sup>4</sup> Rota, "in Calaguritana fructuum," 18 Martii, 1649. *S. Cong. Conc.*, 11 February, 1696.

nops to any line of conduct in this matter. Pius IX. did not go  
 other than to give a warm encouragement<sup>1</sup> to the bishops of the  
 enish provinces to appoint a vicar-general in each diocese in  
 ce of the political and administrative reasons which made many  
 them hesitate and dread the consequences of such an action.

The compiler of the *Schema* for the Constitution "De Episcopis"  
 pared for the Vatican Council does not determine anything more  
 urately, but contents himself with a general statement bearing  
 the vicar-general's usefulness in expediting diocesan business.  
 agni momenti in universæ diocesis negotiis expediendis est  
 arii-generalis officium."<sup>3</sup>

Thus the projected decree which, on account of circumstances  
 nained without any definite discussion, did not affirm any greater  
 ernessity for the vicar-general's office than what could be gathered  
 m existing ecclesiastical laws. The motives for this course of  
 ion which we find in the notes or "adnotationes" added to the  
 ema, appear to have been a certain hesitation in taking sides  
 h one school of canonists in a disputed question of law, espe-  
 ly because the custom of appointing vicars was then practically  
 versal in the Church. "Haud expedire visum est ut obligatio  
 scopis imponeretur vicarium generalem assumendi, qua quidem  
 er re juris canonici interpretes in utramque partem disputant,  
 esertim vero quia nec præcepti necessitas apparet, quando pleri-  
 e omnes episcopi vicarium generalem habent, ejusque opera  
 ntur. Placuit tamen, ut, commemorata utilitate quam vicarius  
 eralis in universis dioceseis negotiis expediendis præstat, hujus  
 nendi opportunitas tacite innueretur."<sup>4</sup>

When may a bishop select his vicar-general? He may do so  
 or to his consecration but not before he takes possession of his  
 either in person or by procurator.

\* \* \* \* \*

Canon law usually favors the appointment of only one vicar-gen-  
 l, but, as we have said, this is often "more honored in the  
 ach than in the observance." In some countries bishops have  
 en several vicars at the same time. About the close of the late  
 ime a very ridiculous custom became prevalent in France.  
 e bishops, constantly recruited from the ranks of the nobility,  
 ading banishment from court, and fearing a life of seclusion in  
 ar-off episcopal country-town, hit upon a very ingenious plan of  
 bing exile of its ennui by forming round them a circle of dis-  
 gushed and honorable ecclesiastics, always chosen from mem-

*Breve*, 6 Martii, 1851.

Vogt. Kirchliche Verordnungen für das Bisthum Rottemburg (Rottemburg, 1863,  
 36). Hinchius, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

*Collectio Lacensis*, xvii. Acta et decreta S. S. Concilii Vaticani, Appendix vi.  
*Schema Constitutionis de Epis. et vicar general.*, Cap. vii., p. 645.

*Ibid.*, adnotationes ad Cap. vii., p. 650.



bers of their own kindred and often of their own family. Thus they kept on adding to the number of their vicars-general in a manner wholly uncalled for and entirely antagonistic to the spirit if not to the letter of canon law. A glance at a sort of ecclesiastical directory of this period, "*La France Ecclesiastique*," of 1789, will show us to what an extent this abuse was carried. There we see the Bishop of Troyes, Mgr. de Barral, with no fewer than seventeen vicars-general; the Bishop of Aix, Boigelin, with thirteen; Cicé, of Bordeaux, with fourteen; Clermont-Tonnerre, of Chalons, with eighteen; Durfort, of Besançon, sixteen; Marbeuf, of Autun, thirteen; Phelypeaux, of Bourges, eighteen; Rohan Guéméné, of Cambrai, twenty; Royere, of Castres, thirteen; Talleyrand-Perigord, of Reims, sixteen, etc. ! We have already given one of the reasons for this unusual and uncalled for number of vicars. Honored with high-sounding titles, entrusted by the confidence of the nation and the traditional glory of centuries with a large influence in public affairs, and occasionally, with a share in local administration, the bishops of the old school had a political prestige to maintain, which forced them to a display of show and worldly pageantry which we, in totally different circumstances, have great difficulty in imagining. If, on the one hand, the bishops were obliged to create this numerous staff, on the other hand, candidates, especially among young ecclesiastics of noble families, were ever eager to solicit admission into a body-guard so honorable, where advancement to the highest dignities was rapid and certain. Custom had even made the title of vicar-general an indispensable qualification for the episcopacy.

The following is given in a periodical, *Les Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques*, which though hostile and often ill-disposed, is still an inexhaustible mine of documentary information on historical matters bearing on the close of the old regime. There<sup>1</sup> we read that "the late king" (Louis XV.), "had in perfect good faith adopted the practice of nominating to vacant sees only those priests who had been vicars-general, taking it for granted that they had thus acquired a thorough knowledge of their priestly ministry and become familiar with the methods of governing a diocese. On that account, quite a number of young priests, fancying their birth and family connections give them a right to the episcopacy, hasten immediately after their ordination to secure the title of vicar-general. Many bishops are weak enough to gratify their wishes, and so these young priests remain in Paris attached to the court without performing any of their priestly functions or learning the duties of a state to which they are self-invited. The result of this abuse is, that a bishop who has in his diocese a sufficient number of vicars-general to help him and to share the task of governing, has also in Paris other

---

<sup>1</sup> *An.*, 1780, p. 110.

ists, entire strangers to his diocese, who usurp a title wholly reserved, and who are known as honorary vicars-general." It would, however, be unfair to form a judgment on this multiplicity of vicars-general founded exclusively on the too-often exaggerated attacks of the time. Circumstances must not be lost sight of. Cathedral chapters had long since ceased to be episcopal counsels. What brought this about? On whom should this responsibility be laid? It would be hazardous to venture on more than a suggestion in an ordinary article. On the one hand, very narrow views (not always foreign to great and otherwise illustrious corporations), and a jealous guarding and fencing in of acquired rights and privileges, joined to a forgetfulness of the higher interests of the diocese; and on the other, the changes effected by the concordat of Francis I., occasioned by the necessities of the epoch, and the new era which necessarily followed the changes for the episcopate: all that would, if analyzed, account for this state of things. Again, the bishops felt the need of advisers and helpers, and the vicars-general could supply that need. Some bishops had the happy secret of drawing round them men of talent and of untiring devotion in the cause of Holy Church. Others, worldly men and worldly prelates, while religiously guarding, from their noble and essentially Christian training, a sentiment of duty on all important occasions, still forgot too often that the true lustre of the Pontiff is best preserved untarnished when freed from the gloss of worldly vanity. These reflections point out to us once more how the slightest infringement of church discipline is ever pregnant of evil consequences. This estrangement between the bishops and their chapters deprived episcopal authority of a much needed check. Sometimes, feeling themselves too isolated and too bereft of advice, the bishops strove to effect a remedy in the creation of a self-chosen counsel. But how vain and limited is unaided human wisdom! For one prelate like Fenelon, willing to listen to advice and to accept correction, how many hundred others could not brook the slightest contradiction nor accept the least suggestion? Richelieu, man of extraordinary talent, a bishop of undoubted merit, whom Abbé Lacroix, in a recent work,<sup>1</sup> shows to us, as filled with apostolic zeal and wise counsels at an age when ecclesiastics, as a rule, employed in the most humble occupations—even Richelieu, was far from appreciating the wholesome monitions of his tenants at Luçon. See in what terms he writes to the vicars-general who had ventured to remonstrate with him. "You are vicars-general, both of you," he writes; "as such your efforts should be to make everything harmonize with my wishes, provided my glory be increased thereby. It would appear from your letter that you were out of temper when you wrote, and as person-

<sup>1</sup> *Richelieu à Luçon*, 1890.

ally, I am so great an admirer of my friends that I am only anxious to discover their good qualities, I think they should be careful not to show themselves to any disadvantage. If an insect has bitten you, kill it and do not try to communicate the poison to those who have escaped the sting. Thank God, I know how to govern myself and moreover, I know how my inferiors should govern themselves . . . . I see no harm in your telling me of any disorders in my diocese, but pray, do so calmly, knowing that any passion is calculated to irritate ardent temperaments like mine. You say, you are ready to resign the title I gave you. I made you vicars-general to oblige you, fancying you capable of being useful to the Church. If I was mistaken in doing so, if instead of pleasing you I grieved you, I am extremely sorry, but I can only remind you, that there is no disease without its remedy. I force my favors on no one . . . . I write to you not in the temper in which you wrote to me, but as a compliment to you. I try to model my style on yours."<sup>1</sup>

What a man of Richelieu's talent could hazard without injuring a good administration, many others without his ability or foresight would imitate to the great detriment of their diocese and annoyance of their clergy.<sup>2</sup>

Nowadays, the plurality of vicars-general is admitted in some countries. In France, for instance, the State recognises<sup>3</sup> and accords<sup>4</sup> a stipend to two vicars-general in each diocese, and to three in each arch-diocese, a practice which at first sight appears somewhat irregular. We must not, however, be too prompt to censure a system sanctioned by custom and approved by a pontifical indult. The possibility of the simultaneous existence of two vicars-general "*in spiritualibus*" in the same diocese is generally admitted by authors, though the multiplicity of procurators, curators and administrators, is considered irregular. The only condition required to make this exceptional state of things admissible

<sup>1</sup> Avenel, *Lettres de Richelieu*, t. i., p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> The substitution of a council of vicars-general for the bishop's canonical council had become so customary that the author of the civil constitution of the clergy, during the French Revolution, suppressed the chapters entirely, and replaced them by a new kind of ecclesiastical senate made up of the bishop's vicars-general, but the bishop was not so free as with those he had alone chosen. "Les vicaires des Eglises cathédrales," the law said, "les vicaires directeurs de séminaires, formeront ensemble le conseil habituel et permanent de l'évêque *qui ne pourra faire aucun acte de juridiction en a qui concerne le gouvernement des diocèse et des séminaire qu' après, en avoir délibéré avec eux.*"

<sup>3</sup> *Art. Organique*, No. 21. "Chaque évêque pourra nommer deux vicaires généraux, et chaque archevêque pourra en nommer trois."

<sup>4</sup> Decree of 22d January, 1853. "A compter du 1st Jan, 1853, les traitements des vic. généraux sont fixes ainsi qu'il suit." "Traitement du pr. vic. gen. de l'archevêque de Paris 4500 fr. traitement des deux autres v.-g. de l'archevêque des Paris et de prem. vic.-gener. des archevêques 3500 fr. Traitement des deux autres vic.-généraux des archevêq. et des vic. gen. des évêques, 2500 fr. Cf. ordonnance, 29th Sep., 1824.

the recognition of an existing custom<sup>1</sup> arising either from the extent of the diocese, or the great number of the clergy or of the people, or from a diversity of races or nationalities within the limits of the same episcopal jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding all this, it seems to us much preferable and more conformable to the text of the law, for a bishop to confine himself to but one vicar-general, even in circumstances similar to those above mentioned. "Unity," as one of the compilers of the "Analecta"<sup>3</sup> remarks, "is perfectly consistent and reconcilable with all the needs of the largest diocese, seeing that the bishop is always free to appoint special delegates, who are not vicars-general in the canonical sense of the word, but who may exercise all the faculties and powers a bishop thinks necessary to give them. It was in this way that St. Charles Borromeo governed his extensive diocese, in which, as every one knows, he joined the most indefatigable zeal to the ablest management. Ferraris,<sup>4</sup> however, on the contrary, holds that bishops are entirely within their rights when they appoint two vicars, especially when the size or wants of a diocese suggest this course. "Maxime si diœcesis multum ampla, ut sic expeditioni causarum facilius consulatur, et facilius expeditantur causæ per plures quam per unum."

We may say then that where the custom is not established no bishop can be forced<sup>5</sup> to have more than one vicar-general, no matter how vast and how important his diocese may be, since, as we have shown, he can appoint vicars forane or rural deans to treat matters of secondary importance.<sup>6</sup>

When it pleases a bishop to have two vicars-general, these two vicar-generals are mutually independent of each other, in the sense that each one has his own proper powers and jurisdiction apart, and is not subordinate to the other. Sometimes the bishop assigns to each of them some special duties in the discharge of which they are respectively responsible, but as a rule each one is answerable for all matters he treats, and as if he alone were vicar-general.<sup>7</sup> The habit of

"Hæ consuetudines," says Santi, p. 215 cognitæ sunt legislatori supremo, et eas non improbat, immo quandoque positive approbat, Romæ enim expediuntur litteræ apostolicæ "Episcopo et vicariis ejusdem in spiritualibus constitutis."

The diocese of Münster has a vicar-general for the part situated in Oldenburg, and another vicar-general for the rest of the diocese. In the diocese of Breslau the same principle is maintained, the Russian part of the diocese having a vicar-general, the Prussian part having another. Cf. Vering *Lehrbuch des Katholischen Orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, p. 596, No. 6.

*Analect. Juris Pontif.*, Au., 1867, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup> Ferraris, *loc. cit.*, p. 571.

"Cogi nequit Episcopus ad constituendum duos, tametsi ob dictam diœcesis amplitudinem ratione magnæ distantiae, asperitatisque viarum maximum subditorum resultet incommodum, si in causis suis tam civilibus quam criminalibus cogantur accedere ad eundem tribunalis et residentiae episcopi ejusve ei assistentis vicarii generalis."

Ardenius, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

*Rota*, Dec., 537, No. 10, p. 4, Recent, tome, 3.

Each of the three vicars-general in Paris has two days a week assigned to him for

referring business to a meeting of vicars-general acting collegialiter would not be conformable to canon law.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is no special formula required for the vicar-general's appointment. Authors, however, supply a few set forms, which have no greater force or importance than the sanction of use. It is not necessary *per se* that the appointment should be made in writing; the only thing required is the intimation of the bishop's choice, but it is evident that letters of appointment should be drawn up in some convenient public form,<sup>1</sup> so as to obviate any difficulty in proving the vicar-general's powers, if they should be called in question.<sup>2</sup> In the early French Church the letters patent were drawn up in the following fashion. "The official instrument," says Ducasse,<sup>3</sup> "to be in good and due form, should be written out by the bishop's secretary, stamped with the official seal, attested to and signed by two reputable witnesses, who must not be relatives or dependents of the principals." Precautions are as necessary here as in the matter of the conferring of benefices.

Bishops now, generally use a formula varying a little in different dioceses, in which they enumerate sometimes briefly—sometimes at length, the various faculties of their vicars-general. In those countries, where by virtue of a concordat, an authorization of the government is needed, the bishop has, moreover, to secure that approval before proceeding to the nomination. Fortunately, the bishops of the United States have nothing to do with such a formality. The appointment of their vicar concerns only themselves.

Is it the very correct thing that they always appoint a priest of their diocese? Is it proper that a parish priest should fulfil that office? . . . These, and many similar ones, are questions of the highest interest, but their multiplicity would extend this article beyond our limits, which at present, we have purposely circumscribed in the historical evolution and the nature of that important ecclesiastical office.

G. PERIES, D D.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON.

---

purely business matters and for acting more directly in the name of the archbishop. Again, each has the special charge of one of the three archdiaconal territories (N. Dame, St. Genevieve, St. Denis). In addition to that, one has to look after all matters referring to interments, cemeteries. Another sees to the interests of the little seminaries, religion in the public schools, institutions and colleges. While the third looks after the hospitals, hospices and charitable institutions of the archdiocese.

<sup>1</sup> *Dixi-Scriptura publica et solemn. Scriptura enim privata vel etiam publica sine solemnialibus in ea requisitis non probatur vicariatus Episcopi.*—Leurenus, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> "Die Ernennung des general Vikars erfolgt durch ein seine Befugnisse angeben- des Decret und wird amtlich publicirt, um eine Gefährdung der Rechtsicherheit innerhalb der diocese zu verhüten." H. Laemmer, *op. cit.*, p. 266. It is the application of the general principle "quod qualem quis se facit, talem debeat se ostendere."

<sup>3</sup> Ducasse, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

## GLADSTONE'S HORACE.

ODES OF HORACE. Translated into English. By *W. E. Gladstone*. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York. 1894.

THE English have been styled "a nation of shop-keepers."

In this view of their character, certainly their immemorialing has not been in vain. For with an unwavering gaze fixed on the "main chance," they have, like Mr. Pecksniff, succeeded, with a hook in one hand and a crook in the other, in "scraping up bits of valuable odds and ends into" their "pouch." But if they have thus become possessed of much of this world's goods, they may redeem the misfortune somewhat by a large-handed liberality. They are perhaps the most unwearied travellers on the face of the earth; and this physical peculiarity of theirs is but the result of their intellectual progress through all the lands of discovery. Palestine is yielding its hidden glories to the pickaxe and shovel of these alien delvers, just as, years ago, the long-ignored historic sites of Babylonia, the Nile-mystery of Africa, and, before that again, the far plains and mighty rivers of India, had already flung wide their portals to the British "Open, ye gates!" Philosophy, history, poetry, archæology, and a thousand other more or less attractive and familiar what-nots—all these are grist for their intellectual mill.

And so it has come to pass that the English tourist and classic antiquary, tracing out the foot-prints of ancient worthies, comes himself with many a sigh of grateful veneration in a little out-of-the-way corner of Italy, watered by the Licenza, a stream which, narrow and quiet in summer, becomes broad and turbulent in winter. From the Anio, into which it pours, trace back its course for some six miles to its source, and you arrive at a place of well-watered valley, made famous forever as the Sabine Farm of Horace. The tourist will also arrive there (although by a different route) to enjoy the ecstasy of an endless Horatian suggestion. The name of this traveller is legion; and he is so unethnically and almost exclusively English, that we shall scarce be at the conviction of the peasants who, wrote Mr. Dennis, believe Horace to have been an Englishman!"

But, as we have said, this geographic journeying is really symptomatic of the much nobler quests of Englishmen in the realms of science and fancy. The streams and founts, the hills and mountains, the cultivated fields and fallow meadows, Tivoli and Baiae, Lucre-

tilis and Licensa—all the haunts dear to the Roman lyrist, and endowed with the common immortality of his verse, were already familiar scenes to the English traveller long ere his feet had journeyed toward their romantic and venerable sites. The school-boy and the collegian had long before thumbed over and over again the dear pages of some well-worn little volume. Horace is the delight of youth and the solace of age. "Hooker escapes with him to the fields to seek oblivion of a hard life, made harder by a shrewish spouse. Lord Chesterfield tells us, 'when I talked my best, I quoted Horace.' To . . . . Wordsworth he is equally dear . . . . in Gibbon's militia days, 'on every march,' he says, 'in every journey, Horace was always in my pocket and often in my hand.' And as it has been, so it is." Thus Sir Theodore Martin, whose own love for Horace adds additional illustration to his statement.

England can furnish names made famous for ingenuity and research in every branch of Horatian literature. The vast labors of Bentley, his critical acumen, his ingenious suggestions, his painstaking and original (if at times faulty) textual emendations; the long catalogue of translators from the early times of Surrey and Sir Philip Sidney—names illustrious in the gradual transplanting of the Sonnet from Italy to England—down even to the present edition of Mr. Gladstone's; the biographical works of Milman and Martin; the clear and compressed commentaries of Maclean and Wickham; the innumerable school-editions and the varied scholastic apparatus designed to awaken and stimulate the interest of the student—all these add to the testimony of English men of letters the most conclusive proof that the "nation of shop-keepers" does not rest content with a mere material advancement.

But after the many admirable translations of Francis, Lord Lytton, Prof. Newman, Conington, Martin, Howes (and a host of others who have translated occasional odes, satires, epistles), we are rather surprised that the "Roman fever" should have found another opportunity to attack, in similar fashion, the greatest of England's statesmen. *Semper ex Anglia aliquid novi.*

In the presence of such a long and successful literary activity in this one field of Horatian translations, we might be tempted to inquire "*cui bono?*" when a new version appears. Mr. Gladstone asks substantially the same question in his Preface and answers it. But before hearing him, we may find in the very nature of the task which a translator sets before himself a large number of sufficiently available answers. For what is that task? It is, to act the part of an echo, to take the place of a mirror. Do we minimize the office and merits of a translation by these comparisons? For indeed an echo is but a faint replication of the parent sound,



s but an *imago*, as the Latins beautifully and truthfully styled. The air-waves that beat on the gateways to the brain and are but a remnant left after their comrades have vanished to the stillnesses of remote cliffs, it may be, or of the nearer ages of heaping brick and stone. A divided chorus, their body is weakened, their spirit is subdued. The image in the ear, like the *imago* of the sound, has also lost many of its fellow waves of light; and the eye catches but a partial glimpse of the full beauty of the object. Hardly better than such reflected images of things is a translation. It is the voice of the singer in wax—a phonograph, if you will, but, like that instrument, lacking necessarily the delicate *nuances* of expression and emphasis, and, above all, of *timbre*, which alone are the distinguishing marks, not indeed so much of the singer, as of the finer phases of personality. If this be true of elegant prose, which has been called “a good way of saying a good thing,” how much more is it of elegant poetry, which is “the best way of saying the best thing.” But in *lyrical* poetry the highest difficulty is melody—the melody of words, the finer shades of diction, the shy beauty, the passing gleams of light or tracks of shadow, the eluding fanciness and play of imagery—let all these be fairly well caught and mirrored, and there is still left the deeper harmony of soul, the heart throbbings, the silent strength of the coursing life-blood, all of which nature has given to her best-beloved children as an inalienable heritage. If this be not true, then is the poet but an exquisitely skillful mechanician—like Hawthorne’s “Artist of the Beautiful,” whose long vigils and infinite pains at length attained their end in a mechanical butterfly, on whose gossamer wings you could see the soft down, in whose eyes you could catch a lustre that seemed instinct with spirit, in whose fluttering wings as it pursued its zigzag course through the air, you might almost fancy a larger life than that which pulses through its lazy folds in the languorous air of summer noons; but whose marvellously delicate contrivances—a parody of the teeming life that forms a spontaneous growth accompanying that of flowers and grasses—crumbled into a hopeless heap of shining fragments in the grasp of an infant-hand.

If, then, the poet be something higher than the mere artist, it will require something better than a mere artist to echo his subtler harmonies, and to mirror forth his finer beauties. But, again, even the poet must condescend to play the part of an echo or a mirror, if he wishes to present a faithful image of the lyrist whom he translates. Otherwise shall we hear, not Horace, but Lytton, Milton, or Dryden, or Gladstone. The translator, possess he never so poetic a soul, must be content to sink his own originality,



fancy, passion, sentiment, in the endeavor to seize, and fix, and reproduce, as far as may be, the thought and feeling of the Horatian original. Otherwise, the echo is confused, the image is blurred. Nevertheless, as we have already hinted, to do this is not to lessen the distinction or usefulness of the translator. For, if he succeeds even fairly in his office of echo or mirror, he has achieved a notable victory over a host of besetting difficulties. If the richest and most versatile accomplishments of translators seem to have presented in English almost a parody of Cicero's exquisite sonorousness, and dignity, and power of expression, how shall the *curiosa felicitas* of Horace be reproduced? If the large liberty of prose be tasked to its utmost, in the endeavor to give a strong idiomatic rendering in English of a strong idiomatic original in Latin, how shall the suggestiveness and coloring of happiest epithets in Horace find an English equivalent amid the hampering necessities of our rhyme and rhythm?

In this difficulty, therefore, we find a sufficient answer to the unthinking query, *cui bono?* What a single translator might not accomplish, becomes the aim of a multiplicity of translations, which, like the outlines of some majestic building caught by the artist from different standpoints, convey an idea of the beauty which cannot be condensed into a single picture. Such an apology was made by a very felicitous translator of the *Dies Iræ*—that monumental Hymn of the Ages—when he published a volume containing no less than thirteen versions from his own pen. He thus pleads in apology: "It has been the aim of the translator to be, in all cases, as faithful as possible to the sense and spirit of the original; and likewise to the letter, but not so slavishly as to preclude variety. He has endeavored to carry out likeness in unlikeness, and to give to each version, so far as practicable, the interest of a distinct poem. How far he has succeeded others must judge; . . . there are some, if he mistakes not, who enjoy those pleasing surprises, in viewing an object, that result from an altered attitude and a new angle of vision—the curious changes which follow every fresh turn of a revolving kaleidoscope—and the writer is therefore willing to believe that such, at any rate, will not be displeased at this attempt to supply the deficiency of one version by another, and yet another, in the hope that thereby the original may be exhibited, approximately at least, in its solid entirety."<sup>1</sup>

And so it happens that we possess in the many translations of Horace, and particularly of Horace's Odes, a many-sided view of the original airy fabric of song. And the side-lights thus thrown

<sup>1</sup> *Dies Iræ*, in *Thirteen Original Versions*, by Abraham Coles, M.D., Ph.D., fifth edition, p. xxx.-xxx.

the metrical and poetic and rhythmic character of the Odes are truth really illustrative and not fanciful. Of course, a verse which depends on quantity, and not on accent, cannot be fairly presented in English, but it may be imitated by a judicious selection and combination of metres, and of such syllables as even an ordinarily attentive ear would judge to be longer or shorter in English. Again, the same poetic instinct which led Horace to select certain forms of strophe for certain definite trends of thought, may very well be exercised in any language. But here no well-defined law indicates such selection, but rather that baffling instinct or sense of rhythm which is so peculiarly the native gift of the poet. Nor will this rhythmic sense choose amongst all peoples the same measure for the expression of the same thought or emotion. Thus, to Horace, the iambus, from its swift motion (*pes citus*, as he called it in the "Ep. ad Pison.") seemed principally significant of the rapid heats of anger,—*in celeres iambos misit furor*—the *fervor* of Ode I., xvi., 24, which Mr. Gladstone well translates:

"In olden time  
Fever heat within me burned,  
Tempted, and my youthful prime  
To those hot iambs turned."

Horace again alludes to his conception of the significance of this metre in the "Epis. ad Pison."—*iambo rabies Archilochum armavit*—which armed him so well, indeed, that Lycambes and his daughters destroyed themselves, it is said, to escape the poisoned tips of his iambic darts. But in English the same metre has no special relation to satire or invective, nor, indeed, to any class of emotions possibly because, being the easiest and most natural of all the metres for our English tongue, it has been used for the expression of all kinds of thought and feeling, and has been thus traditionally associated with the most diverse sentiments. Generally, indeed, when being considered a *pes citus*, the iambic moves with grace—lightness, and often even with a heavy solemnity. The play of the gentler emotions, the strong influence of the sublime, alike seek iambics for appropriate expression. In French, as in English, it is the dominant meter, and in both it has been specially consecrated to the office fulfilled of old by the hexameter, that

"stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man,"

Without pursuing farther this suggestive inquiry, let us see to what advantage Mr. Gladstone has sought in a diversity of rhythmic ministration. Mr. Conington had made it a fixed law for himself in his translation of the odes to render all the poems written in one metre by Horace into one metre in English; for he judged that identity in form should exist alike in the translations

and in the originals. But from what we have just said concerning the different and quite diverse uses of the same metre by different peoples—exemplified very strikingly by the iambics of Latin, English and French poetry—it will be readily seen that Mr. Conington had assumed as a basis of his law what is not strictly true. The sentiment which should find best rhythmic expression in Sapphics, for example, might also find best expression in English in, let us say, trochaics. But another quite diverse sentiment which should also seek best expression in Sapphics might not find an equally serviceable expression in English trochaics. The genius of the language and of its poetic structure is so different, the temperaments of Southron and Northerner interpret the same rhythms so differently, traditional usages have so altered the elder characteristics of verse, that no such definite law may be established as Mr. Conington postulated. Here must poetic instinct and feeling be the best judge. Discussing Mr. Conington's rule, Mr. Gladstone indicates very truly "two fundamental objections to this rule. The first is that the quantity of matter which the poet has given in the same forms of stanza is by no means uniform; and, if uniformity is to govern the translation, the space available for conveying what has to be conveyed will be sometimes too great and sometimes too small. There is another objection which lies yet nearer the root of the matter. Horace has in numerous cases employed the same metre for odes the most widely divergent in subject and character. Nothing, for example, can be farther apart in their spirit than Ode I., ix., suggested by the view of Soracte, and the great Ode of Regulus (III., v.), the loftiest in the whole collection. But these are both written in Alcaics. Again, the Ode on Hypermnestra may fairly be called heroic; while the ode addressed to Lydia in the First Book (xxv.) is amatory and in a high degree coarse. Yet both of them are Sapphic odes. Horace knew the capacities of his respective metres and how far he could make each of them elastic for particular varieties of use. But it does not follow that any one English metre, which the translator may have chosen for some one Horatian ode, will be equally supple and equally effective for conveying the spirit and effect of every other ode which Horace may have found it practicable to construct under the same metrical conditions. Every one of the odes, as a rule, has a spirit, genius and movement of its own; and we hold that the translator from Horace should both claim and exercise the largest possible freedom in varying his metres, so as to adapt them in each case to the original with which he has to deal. To adopt this rule is not really to relax the laws of his work, but only to improve the instrument with which he is to perform it."

Sir Theodore Martin, while claiming and freely exercising the right to vary at will the rhythms and stanza-forms of his translations, suggests another reason—the difficulty of locating delicately in any one English metre the intractable proper names of antiquity: “The form of verse into which each ode has been cast has been generally selected with a view to what might best reflect its prevailing tone. It has not always been possible, however, to follow this inclination, where, as frequently happens, either the names of persons or places, often most intractable, but always important, must have been sacrificed, or a measure selected into which these could be interwoven.”

Bulwer constructs the strangest forms of stanza and verse; but he explains that readers who have thought his forms unrhythmic and unpleasant have come, after a re-perusal, to side more or less with his own doctrine. A strong contrast is found in the still rigorous version of Francis, whose use of iambic measures is almost unbroken and whose stanzas vary in construction but slightly from each other.

The contrast between the rhythms of Francis and of Bulwer is not more striking than that between the rhymeless verse of the latter and the tintinnabulation of rhyme in Francis, which becomes at last as familiar to the ear as the ticking of a clock. The question is immediately mooted: Should an unrhymed original be rendered into rhymed verse? The great names in poetic literature quoted in theory against the use of rhyme as puerile and ungratified, useless and hampering, might also be quoted in practice when, however, being actually poets, the divine frenzy might, (perhaps, have unsettled their reason!) for the very opposite side of the question. The Greeks used no rhyme; the Latins, in their golden age, carefully avoided it, but in their silver age used sparingly or, say rather, permitted its accidental occurrence; in mediæval Latin poetry, rhyme and accented metre quite supplanted the ancient forms. Hear Ben Jonson, in his “Fit of Rhyme against Rhyme:”

Greek was free from this infection;  
Happy Greek, by this protection,  
Was not spoiled;  
Whilst the Latin, queen of tongues,  
Is not yet free from rhyme's wrongs,  
But rests foiled.

\* \* \* \* \*

Vulgar languages that want  
Words and sweetness and be scant  
Of true measure,  
Tyrant rhyme hath so abused  
That they long since have refused  
Other censure.

But rare Ben condescended to rhyme even when translating from the rhymeless Latin, and his rhymes, harsh as they must often appear to the more exacting musical sense of our day, and exhibiting strong examples of the "heresy" known as "allowable" rhymes, we should prefer to have where they are, even with all their imperfections on their head. His "Intermissa Venus Diu," as altered by Mr. Martin to conform better to modern diction and rhyme, has really suffered in its attractive quaintness, but has undoubtedly gained in its rhymic features. Bulwer's and Gladstone's renderings of this ode are perfect contrasts in respect of metre and rhyme; but both are elegant versions, and may not be quoted for either side of the argument. The fact seems to be that in Bulwer's versions the ear is cheated into an apprehension of rhyme, just as in Collins' matchless "Ode to Evening"; but the art, sufficiently exquisite to accomplish this for once, must fail if thus exercised frequently—disappointment, rather than pleasurable surprise, is the dominant emotion called forth in the reader.

Milton, like Ben Jonson, has also been quoted against rhyme, and certainly his translation of the "Ode to Pyrrha" should seem to prove his sufficient apology. But surely this might well pass as an exception—*peperit semel sed leonem*. We could not spare, in his Nativity Hymn, the added beauty of rhyme. In this matter of rhyme, Mr. Gladstone follows the high standard of present-day usage. He thinks the translator "should severely limit his use of licentious and imperfect rhymes."

Leaving thus the question of rhyme, the Ode to Pyrrha just alluded to suggests the inquiry whether it would not be well to imitate, in so far as any of our English metres and stanza-forms might, the peculiar metres and strophes of Horace. To the lover of the Venusian bard, the very forms of his poems are pictures of beauty; they have gradually assumed features of added attractiveness from the many hours spent in the contemplation of their charms; they have gathered around them the thousand associations of boyhood and manhood, of student-life and world-life; their graceful structures have housed not alone the thoughts of Horace, but as well the fancies and feelings those thoughts have awakened in the heart of the reader. Could not these strophe-forms be imitated if not reproduced? Milton's imitation of the Alcaic stanza of the Ode to Pyrrha is an illustration in point. Quaintly beautiful as is his diction in this version, not less attractive is the very form of his verse, which brings back, by the easiest association of ideas, the rich rhythms of the original, the cameo-like setting of the thought, and, together with these, the very words of Horace. Original and translation are thus made to supplement each other; and whatever is lacking in literalness, or felicity of expression, or

the imaging of thought and fancy—and what version must not  
 force lack some of these?—shall be supplied by an unconscious  
 part of imagination in the reader. Milton's version offers a close  
 approximation to such a desirable similarity; but English metres  
 be made to do better work still. Tennyson, the master-work-  
 man of rhythm, showed us how this might be done, in his lines to  
 Milton:

Oh, mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies,  
 Oh, skilled to sing of time and eternity,  
 God-gifted organ-voice of England —  
 Milton, a name to resound for ages.

Alcaics, quite difficult to imitate thus closely, can be made so  
 odious in English, what shall we say of the Sapphic—a metre  
 second to Alcaic in the esteem of Horace? The imitations  
 in English are many, and in some cases very felicitous.  
 But just here, *à propos* of Sapphics, a word of caution might not  
 be amiss. There are two ways of reading a Sapphic verse: the  
 first, which is the correct way, takes strict account of the succes-  
 sion of long and short syllables, and thus secures a stately dignity  
 removed from the tripping jingle of the *second*, which is the in-  
 correct but the ordinary way of the plodding school-boy, who falls  
 naturally into the vulgar dactylic measure. We have seen  
 how to work on versification the following quoted as an illustration  
 of Sapphics in English:

Never—ah me—now, as in days aforetime  
 Rises o'erwhelming memory—'tis banished!  
 Scenes of loved childhood, cannot ye restore time,  
 Though it has vanished?

The jingle is as follows:

Rises o'er | whelming | memory, | 'tis ban | ished,

head of the much more dignified flow in this close imitation (To  
 Sappho in Sapphics):

Maid of | Lesbos, | sad | is thy | lonely | island;  
 Yea, in saddest gloom is the green of thy land;  
 Thee thy maidens weep in the vale and highland—  
 Weep I for my land!

It will be observed that the cesural pause is not happy in the  
 above quotation; indeed, in few, if any, of the imitations we have  
 seen upon, is the full meaning of the Latin cesura apprehended.  
 It is needless to point out first that it should occur after a syllable  
 falling over, as it were, into the third foot, from at least a dissyl-

labic word of the second foot ; and secondly, that it should form a natural phrasal resting-place.

Other metres of Horace, notably the Asclepiadean, would present, perhaps, insuperable difficulties in the way of a happy imitation. But as the bulk of the metres in Horace are Alcaic or Sapphic, much at least could be accomplished in this matter. In the face of the many hampering necessities of such imitations, rhyme would probably be abandoned, and, indeed, could then be spared.

Mr. Gladstone has not attempted imitation in his metres. The work he set himself to do was surely arduous enough without any further embarrassment of rhythm than that which easy iambs might furnish : "The conditions of that work, if it is to be properly done are, as I view them, sufficiently severe. He (*i.e.*, the translator) should largely abridge the syllabic length of the Latin text ; should carry compression to the farthest practicable point ; should severely limit his use of licentious and imperfect rhymes ; should avoid those irregularities in the use of the English genitive, which are so fatal to euphony, even though he find any of them supported by the authority of Shakespeare, for example in the line—

Come, Cassius' sword, and find Titinius' heart. —*Julius Caesar*, v., 3.

He should endeavor, with whatever changes of mere form, to preserve in all cases the sense and point of his author, and should sparingly allow the perilous but seductive doctrine of free translation. At the same time he must respect the genius of the English tongue, and aim at the easy flow of his numbers. With these purposes in his eye, he will find that he has no easy task in hand.' In these words we have Mr. Gladstone's apology for offering a new translation of Horace : "Perhaps a serious, even if very imperfect, endeavor to attain these ends may excuse or warrant the addition made by this small volume to the existing translation of the Horatian Odes." But the requisite he seems to consider the most essential is that of *compression*. This is, indeed, the real purpose of his work. He thinks that Milton and Conington are almost alone in giving to this necessity an adequate share of attention. He thinks that "without compression, a translation from Horace, whatever its other merits may be, ceases to be Horatian ; ceases, that is, to represent the original. It also ceases to represent the author, who, more perhaps than any writer among the ancients, has revealed his personality in his works ; a personality highly interesting, and yet more signally instructive."

Mr. Gladstone very justly, we think, regards compression as of essential moment in any translation of Horace—the first of all Latin lyrists—whose chief excellence lies in *form* rather than in

ght, in art rather than in nature. Horace was a successful, extremely laborious, artist. He did not emulate Pindaric poets nor allow himself the rich freedom of dithyrambs or of epics freed from the shackles of rule. His art was not even

To vent new words, and measures pour  
Unheard before,

Mr. Gladstone forcibly translates (iv., 2). His poems were not written for the throbbing pulse of the people—who did not exist but for the fastidious and elegant culture of his imperial or aristocratic patrons. His presents to these shall be small, but they shall be highly-polished gems. His art was crystallization, and the translator who fuses the diamond in the crucible of his own mind must possess artistic chemistry enough to bring forth anew one highly polished and elegantly cut.

To have succeeded even fairly well in this task is to have overcome great difficulties, and to have rendered sufficient apology for the great volume of translations from Horace; and this Mr. Gladstone has done. We are tempted to quote largely in illustration, but must forbear. We have referred frequently to Milton's translation of the *Ode to Pyrrha*. He has reproduced the diamond so successfully that "no English translator of Horace," it has been said, "can ever pass this ode of his poet without dipping his colors to the original as he goes by." Bulwer does not attempt a translation, but simply reprints Milton's version, with the remark that he cannot presume to attempt any rhymeless version of this ode in juxtaposition with Milton's famous translation." So, too, Conington would not attempt, at first, a translation, but contented himself with reprinting Milton. Mr. Martin, who translated it in blank verse, did not attain the felicity of Mr. Gladstone's exquisite rendering. The attentive reader must immediately note how Milton's version is equalled in rhythm and surpassed in intelligibility by that of Mr. Gladstone.

It may be fairly assumed (as a corollary to the history of Horace's translations, and to the demonstration it furnishes of the impossibility of a perfect version) that in no single rendering can be produced more than a part of the original beauty. Paraphrases have been made which will stand a very favorable comparison with the originals, and may, indeed, be justly regarded as in reality superior poems. But the critic should always bear in mind that the principal merit—perhaps we should say *essential requisite* rather than *merit*—of any version is *faithfulness* to the original in meaning and sentiment. This is so essential as hardly to brook the sacrifice of merit. After this, the translators look at the original from different standpoints; and as all the other desirable elements



may not be secured in a single version, every translator is free to follow the bent of his own genius, the suggestion of his own taste, in his selection of metres, rhymes, rhythmic softness or ruggedness, phrasal extension or compression. Mr. Gladstone has laid especial stress on this last as essential in the endeavor to mirror the artistic mould of Horace's verse. This constitutes, probably, the grandest difficulty to be met with in translating Horace, but principally in those poems which contain many proper names. In the Sixth Ode of the First Book Mr. Gladstone indicates, in a footnote, the extreme difficulty he encountered in the fourth stanza; but for an illustration of this difficulty, and as an example of the varying views taken by translators of the necessity of compression, we prefer to select an ode which is singularly free from the embarrassment of proper names. This is the First of the Third Book—the grand *Odi profanum vulgus*. The metre is Alcaic—the stanza containing, therefore, three variant lines. Mr. Gladstone has, perhaps unfortunately, adopted a stanza consisting of four iambic tetrameters, and has lost, therefore, not a little of the rhythmic variety so striking in the original and so peculiarly fitted for halting the reader, as it were, at some sudden turn of the journey, which brings him face to face with a precipice of unexpressed surmise, or the sublime mountain-peak of some lofty conception, or it may be with some avalanche of Pindaric expression pouring down from that snowy peak

velut amnis, imbres  
Quem super notas aluere ripas.

This great ode is a magnificently constructed portal to the solid and stately fabric of song in the Third Book. In this book, and particularly in the first series of odes, the exquisite art and diction of the Roman Lyrist shine forth in undimmed splendor. Some of these odes, indeed, Scaliger would place beside the work of Pindar himself, while of this First Ode he says: "*Magnifico dicendi genere structa est.*"

In strong contrast with the rather monotonous, but withal stately, stanzas of Mr. Gladstone, is the free Pindaric verse of Sir Theodore Martin. Hear his apology: "The Pindaric verse, introduced by Cowley, and carried by Dryden to perfection, has been adopted in translating this ode, the Fourteenth Ode of the Fourth Book, and the Secular Hymn, as the only measure in which the requisite freedom of movement could be attained for grappling with the originals. This verse—whilst in some respects it tempts to amplification—is favorable to closeness in others, inasmuch as the translator is not tied down, as in our ordinary stanza, to a regularly-recurring rhyme. Dryden, with his usual mastery of critical ex-

tion, has said all that can be said of this noble form of verse :  
 r variety—or, rather, where the majesty of thought requires  
 the numbers may be stretched to the English heroic of five  
 and to the French Alexandrine of six. But the ear must  
 ide, and direct the judgment to the choice of numbers. With-  
 the nicety of this, the harmony of Pindaric verse can never be  
 plete. . . .” He thus translates the first stanza :

Ye rabble rout, avaunt !  
 Your vulgar din give o'er,  
 Whilst I, the Muses' own hierophant,  
 To the pure ears of youths and virgins chant  
 In strains unheard before !

s usual, Bulwer employs the largest liberty, although he ekes  
 his stanza—wholly unembarrassed though he be by rhyme or  
 the cramping necessities of a formal metre—with a fourth line,  
 ch has no type in the original !

I hate the uninitiate crowd—I drive it hence away ;  
 Silence while I, the Muses' priest, chant hymns unheard before ;  
 I chant to virgins and to youths,  
 I chant to listeners pure.

both of these versions exhibit a large liberty of expression.  
 y little, if any, attempt has been made in them to *compress* the  
 lish diction into Horatian limits. The opposite would rather  
 n to be the case in both ; for while Horace completes his theme  
 rty-eight lines of the Alcaic stanza—a small compass—Bulwer  
 the large build of the stanza just quoted, and finds it expedi-  
 to add to the words of the original (as in the fourth line of the  
 act quoted) in order to fill out his measure. On the other  
 d, Martin varies the stanza very considerably and constructs a  
 ric form wholly dissimilar to that of Horace. With such  
 dom from the prison-house of a formal and invariable metre,  
 might well expect more compression in Martin than even Bul-  
 has succeeded in obtaining. But the reverse is the fact. The  
 y-eight lines of Horace are expanded into eighty-two in the  
 slation. Manifestly, the crystal has been dissolved in the  
 ter of crystallization.” What was mere suggestion in Horace  
 been amplified into detailed statement ; and while a closer con-  
 ion of thought is thus made evident, and a blending of the  
 hm of the stanza secured, the crisp statement and diction, the  
 ple thought of the original, are too freely sacrificed. Mr.  
 tin's translation is unquestionably a sonorous and striking  
 m ; but if compression be a virtue in a translation of Horace  
 it be uniquely essential in an attempt to retain the cameo-  
 fineness of word-graving so peculiarly the artistic merit of

Horace—then can neither Martin nor Bulwer claim to have achieved a great success in their versions of this admirable ode.

Mr. Gladstone, on the contrary, has achieved here a very notable success. Without sacrificing rhyme or rhythm, without availing himself of the Pindaric liberty of metre and diction which Mr. Martin vindicated to himself, without making the verse grind its harsh consonantal elements against each other—he has translated not the thought alone, but as well the exquisite simplicity of diction and the crystalline sparkle of form. To quote a few stanzas :

Begone, vile mob, I bar my door,  
Silence! the muses' priest, I bring  
My gift: my strains unheard before,  
To virgins and to youths I sing.

Kings firmly rule their subject realms,  
But over kings Jove holds the rod;  
The Giant brood he overwhelms,  
And moves all nature with his nod.

\* \* \* \* \*  
The sword hangs bare o'er impious wrong:  
For it, Sicilian cates will lack  
Their dainty flavor, nor shall song  
Of bird or lyre bring slumber back.

The gentle sleep that rustics know,  
By choice frequents the humble cot;  
Sweet Tempe's vale, where Zephyrs blow,  
And shaded banks disdaining not.

Tempestuous seas need not appal  
The measured craving of the wise;  
Arcturus verging to his fall,  
Or Kid-star at his gloomy rise.

#### Martin's version of

Sed Timor et Minae  
Scandunt eodem, quo dominus, neque  
Decedit aerata triremi et  
Post equitem sedet atra Cura.

is very striking—much more impressive than Mr. Gladstone's, but much less condensed and much less faithful :

But let him climb in pride,  
That lord of halls unblest,  
Up to his lordly nest,  
Yet ever by his side  
Climb Terror and Unrest;  
Within the brazen galley's sides,  
Care, ever watchful flits,  
And at his back when forth in state he rides,  
Her withering shadow sits.

Mr. Gladstone's version is very literal; but, from the necessity of conforming to his original metre, it cannot lead up to such a climax as "Climb Terror and Unrest," nor imitate the antithesis between the dactylic galloping of the steed and the heavy and slow trochaic shadowing of Care; *Post equitem sedet atra curia*—a verse which, simple though it be, exhibits, in our opinion, perhaps the finest use of metre ever made by Horace in wedding form to sense. Mr. Gladstone translates:

But Fears and Threats can clamber fast  
As lords of land; in wealth's despite  
On beaked yacht sits Care aghast,  
And rides behind the mounted knight.

No one who has not read Horace can enjoy fully even the best translation. He is the "untranslatable poet." And the judgment which will be passed on his merit must be very one-sided, and not very flattering, when it is based simply on translation, however minutely done. In judging of the worth of any version, this fact must be taken into account. For no lover of the Lyrist's muse needs a translation either for its absolute beauty or its power of illustrating the original. Translations can, indeed, often give "a copy rendering, or an ingenious suggestion;" for a poet appreciates, not so much intellectually, as instinctively, the iridescence of imagery and sentiment, the quaint appropriateness of diction, the physical measures, the rhythmic sonorousness, the rugged virility, the languorous softness of expression echoing appropriate emotions. And it is certain, on the other hand, that a mere intellectual analysis has not seldom caused the learned commentator to err egregiously in his interpretation of the scope and import of the poem. Still, it is not for such a side-light of fancy, such an illustration of copy diction, that a lover of Horace buys immediately and reads over every new version of his favorite. He has known his name too long to welcome the aid of a literary phrenologist to assist in estimating his character. It is to judge the translation by the original, rather than the original by the translation, that he welcomes the latest addition to the literature of Horace! Mr. Gladstone did not intend that his volume should serve as an "Introduction" to the study of Horace; and any criticism of that volume is hardly fair, which is disappointed at not finding in it a pleasant collection of English poems. The "compression" aimed at by Mr. Gladstone, while it should best illustrate the peculiarity of Horace, could not but defeat any striving after the graces of English verse. In addition to this, the mythologic references of Horace, *literally* translated, must seem Wagnerian mysticism to non-classicists. Other translators, by paraphrase and versified com-

mentary, have endeavored to render such references intelligible; but have only succeeded in writing practically original poems. Mr. Gladstone, on the contrary, translated, we assume, not for the vulgar herd of sciolists, but for Horatian scholars. No pedantic elucidations of the text are offered in prolegomena, foot-notes, or annotations. The reader of this volume is supposed to be a familiar of Horace and other ancient worthies:

The bards sublime  
Whose distant footsteps echo  
Down the corridors of Time.

Occasionally a foot-note appears; but its purpose is not explanatory so much as apologetic—to indicate some special difficulty but partially overcome, some vulgar crudeness softened, some strange literalness vindicated. An example of this last is found in the fourth stanza of Book I., Ode xii.

First comes the Parent's classic praise,  
Who seas, and earth, and seasons sways,  
And the vast All, with sovereign ken  
O'er gods and men.

He renders *parentis* literally, for the reason that "here only Jupiter is described in Horace by this word, which I have thought it well to preserve." Martin translates, "the world's great *sire*"—a needlessly amplificative phrase which is implied by the rest of the stanza; Bulwer has "*Father-King*"—the "king" being likewise implied in what follows; Christopher Pitt simply translates "*Jove*"—losing the fine suggestion of *parentis* which explains the reason of this power, the basis and character of the rule of the *Farcus*.

After reading a number of extended versions of Horace it is pleasing to find a version which simply translates. The other extreme, namely, a very free paraphrase, such as Cowley's *Odi Profanum*, does not pretend to be a translation, and becomes at once an English poem whose merits are to be passed on without any reference to the original imitated. Either extreme—compression, or the largest amplification—is satisfying to the reader; the first, because it is what it claims to be—a translation; the second, because it also is what it claims to be—no translation at all. Very wisely, we think, has Mr. Gladstone avoided the rock on which so many other translators have split—the attempt to dress up in modern finery the classic simplicity of the old diction; the desire to make "poetic" poetry out of a rather prosy original. For be it known that very much of Horace's excellence lay in his artistic manipulation of metres in which he was not "to the manner born."

deep feeling he not only did not pretend to, but (with a few exceptions) formally and expressly avoided. His diction was not meant to be anything else than clear-cut and highly polished, suggestive rather than full, elegant rather than rich, refined rather than enthusiastic. But the whole trend of our modern English poetry is at complete variance with such a type. Depth of sentiment, enthusiasm of expression, not a little mysticism and star-bracing idealism,—these to-day form our poetic dress which, if we should extend to the poetic realm Carlyle's "Philosophy of Clothes," might soon point the moral of the age we live in—the loss of that sovereignty of the *people* which Horace's epoch did not know. The modern poets no longer form the clientèle of some worldly patron to whose "hours of ease" they might minister a not over-stimulating pleasure. On the contrary, they strive, with what success they may, to formulate the dreamings and schemings, the dim intuitions and vague longings, of the large heart of humanity. And so it has come to pass that the best attempts to popularize Horace in translation have failed. The old too often masquerades under the trappings of the new; and the reader experiences the weariness of stage-properties where he expected to find living men and women. Francis's version is still a favorite for the very reason that he did not attempt to capture with glittering tinsel and gaudy frippery. Bulwer errs by adopting a blustering style of metres which, we feel sure, while it affects the lover of Horace with the same sense of strangeness and awkwardness which Horace's own metres would cause in the mind of the *pro-num vulgus*, fails of its imitative design; for it neither reproduces the metres familiar to the Horatian student, nor offers to the uninitiate crowd "a pleasing substitute for those rhythms which unfigured Alcaeus and Sappho of old, and which afterwards amid the *dilettante* culture of Augustan Rome, leveled at their successful transplanter the admiring fingers of the passers-by. Martin, too, attempts to make absolute English poems of a poetry which has no affinity with ours. He improves on the original both in action and in sentiment, and draws dangerously near to "poetic" poetry. But this is really not Horace, but Martin; and whatever rank Horace held amongst his contemporaries, certainly Sir Theobald did not pretend to amongst our latter day poets. Horace in translation will please no public except the academic public. And this class, if it desire English poetry, will turn for all that is best to Tennyson, or Wordsworth, or Lowell, or Browning. It welcomes translations, not for their own merit, but because of their relationship to the dear old Epicurean whose homely views of life, rather than his natural ethics and philosophy, have approved themselves, like the proverbs of the peoples, to the experience of all

men, and all ages, and all climes. This public will easily grow weary of any pompous disquisition on the morality of the comfortable old pagan whose whole theology and philosophy was comprised in the "golden mean" of natural likes and dislikes. It cares not for his gods and goddesses, his imperial patron, his high-living associates—not even for those natural beauties made famous in his verse, except in so far as they give "a local habitation and a name" to his "airy nothings." Whatever of poetic fancy there is in his mythology it will tolerate graciously enough; but what it seeks first is the companionship of the man himself who, a freed-man's son, could win the affection of a Mæcenas, and the esteem of an Augustus. Its hero was a pagan, and not a Christian. It recognizes this thoroughly, and reads everywhere between the lines the sadness of a soul that must bid an eternal *Ave et Vale* to its dead half, its loved Mæcenas. But the homely truths of experience, resting not on a supernatural but on a natural basis in this pagan's philosophy, it finds crystallized into gem-like phrases which have become coin current in all literatures. And so, despising the basis of his ethics, it can see not a little truth in his exposition of the poetry of life. What merit shall such a public as this require in a translator? Mr. Gladstone's answer is the best—*compression*, and *not* amplification; *literalness*, and *not* paraphrase; delicacy, and *not* depth; simplicity, and *not* grandeur.

In vain, we conclude, shall Horace appeal in translation to the sympathies of any but a Horatian audience. Our modern "University Extension" scheme of pouring doses of classical information into minds that are wholly unequal to the task of assimilating it properly, is happily exploded at last. Imagine the young gentlemen and young ladies of to-day discussing—*through translation!*—the merits of Horace at their afternoon teas! Mr. Gladstone has been accused, in harsh terms, of not having written versions of Horace which might be classed as English poems. We think his apology is found in the truth we have been trying to illustrate in the foregoing remarks. He wrote for old lovers and familiars of the Venusian Singer, *habitués* of his house, companions at his table. These needed no introduction to their genial host of the Sabine Farm; these do not care to discuss his religion, his mythology, his morality, his sparkling conversation, his dignified familiarity with patrons of his muse, or any other of the thousand literary topics suggested by his name to the amateur critics at five o'clock teas; these have known him too long to feel any vanity of acquaintanceship, or to publish their own acquirements by discussing his; these will regard Mr. Gladstone's book as the latest tribute alike to the excellence of their bard, and to the wide culture of his eminent translator. Gratified with the patronage of his illus-

us name and the example of his life-long admiration, they will  
 in pick up the well-worn volume which can suggest so many  
 e things that it contains; which is an epitome of their earliest  
 plastic efforts, a record of their maturer reflections, an elegant  
 expression of life's experiences. Again shall "Ustica's upland  
 ," pleasant Lucretilis, and Digentia's "gelid stream," banish  
 n their eyes the smoke of the city, and from their ears the dis-  
 tumult of its denizens. Again shall the "cheap Sabine wines"  
 er a goodly company around the festal board; or if haply it  
 he Kalends of March,

This day shall burst  
 The amphor's seal, and taste the juice  
 Under Consul Tullus first  
 Seasoned in the smoke for use.

Mæcnas will then be present, to "quaff cups a score," and  
 will "burn the torches till the day." In the accompanying  
 of soul they shall hear, indeed, the affectionate raillery which  
 ers while it cures, but

"No scandal while you dine  
 But honest talk and wholesome wine,  
 And only hear the magpie gossip  
 Garrulous, under a roof of pine."

ever and anon shall come up from the dreamy page a picture  
 ne gray hairs but sturdy form of a second Mæcnas, the min-  
 of a gentler Cæsarism than that of old, the patron of letters  
 nce and of a higher life still than that of literature—the Grand  
 Man whom the peoples have learned to love, while their princes  
 e fain to cherish.

H. T. HENRY.

CHARLES' SEMINARY, OVERBROOK, PA.



## THE ENCYCLICAL.

VENERABILIBVS FRATIBVS  
ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS  
FOEDERATARVM AMERICA SEPTENTRIONALIS CIVITATVM.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES  
SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

**L**ONGINQUA oceani spatia animo et cogitatione traicimus: et quamquam vos allocuti alias scribendo sumus, maxime quoties ad episcopos catholici orbis communes litteras pro auctoritate dedimus, modo tamen affari vos separatim decrevimus, hoc videlicet consilio ut prodesse aliquid catholico nomini apud vos, Deo volente, possimus. Idque summo studio curâque aggredimur: propterea quod et plurimi facimus et magnopere diligimus americanum, validum iuventâ, genus: in quo plane non civilis tantummodo, sed christianae etiam rei cernimus animo incrementa latentia.

Exitum quarti ab explorata America saeculi cum tota gens vestra haud multo ante gratâ recordatione atque omni significatione, ut erat dignum, concelebraret, Nos item auspicatissimi facti memoriam vobiscum recolimus communionem laetitiae et similitudine voluntatis. In illoque tempore vota quidem pro incolumitate et magnitudine vestra absentes fecisse, haud satis habuimus: in optatis erat coram, aliqua ratione, vobis adesse gestientibus: ob eam rem libentes, qui gereret personam Nostram, misimus.

Quae vero in illa celebritate vestra fecimus, non iniuria fecimus: quia americanum genus, vix editum in lucem ac prope vagiens in cunis, sinu amplexuque suo Ecclesia parens excepit. Quod enim alias datâ operâ demonstravimus, navigationum laborumque hunc in primis fructum Columbus petiit, aditum christiano nomini per novas terras novaque maria patefacere: qua in cogitatione constanter inhaerens, quibuscumque appulsus oris, nihil habebat antiquius, quam ut Crucis sacrosanctae simulacrum defigeret in littore. Quapropter sicut arca Noetica, exudantes supergressa fluctus, semen vehebat Israelitarum cum reliquiis generis humani, eodem modo commissae oceano Columbianae rates et principium magna-

civitatum et primordia catholici nominis transmarinis oris  
cere.  
nae postea consecuta sunt, non est huius loci singula persequi.  
reptis ab homine Ligure gentibus, etiam tum agrestibus,  
gelium maturrime illuxit. Satis enim est cognitum quot e  
ciscana familia, item ex Dominicana et Loiolaea, duobus con-  
tribus saeculis, istuc navigare huius rei gratiâ consueverint, ut  
ctas ex Europa colonias excolerent, sed in primis et maxime  
christiana sacra indigenas ex superstitione traducerent, con-  
tis non semel cruento testimonio laboribus. Nova ipsa oppi-  
estris compluribus et fluminibus et montibus et lacubus im-  
a nomina docent perspicueque testantur Ecclesiae catholicae  
iis vestras penitus impressas origines.—Neque illud fortasse  
aliquo divinae providentiae consilio factum, quod heic com-  
oramus: cum americanae coloniae libertatem ac principatum,  
antibus hominibus catholicis, adeptae, in rempublicam coa-  
iure fundatum, tunc apud vos est ecclesiastica hierarchia rite  
tituta: et quo tempore magnum Washingtonum ad governa-  
ei publicae admovit populare suffragium, eodem pariter tem-  
auctoritate apostolica primus est Americanae Ecclesiae epis-  
praepositus. Amicitia vero consuetudoque familiaris, quam  
cum altero constat intercessisse, documento videtur esse,  
ratas istas civitates concordîâ amicitîaque coniunctas esse  
siae catholicae oportere. Neque id sane sine causa. Non  
potest nisi moribus bonis stare res publica; idque acute vidit  
que primarius ille civis vester, quem modo nominavimus, in  
anta fuit vis ingenii prudentiaeque civilis. Sed mores bonos  
e et maxime continet religio quippe quae suapte naturâ  
pia cuncta custodit ac vindicat ex quibus officia ducuntur,  
sitisque ad agendum momentis maximis, iubet cum virtute  
, peccare vetat. Quid autem est Ecclesia aliud, nisi societas  
na, voluntate iussuque Iesu Christi conservandae morum  
tati tuendaeque religioni condita? Hanc ob rem, quod  
ex hoc pontificatus fastigio persuadere conati sumus, Eccle-  
idem, quamquam per se et naturâ suâ salutem spectat ani-  
m, adipiscendamque in caelis felicitatem, tamen in ipso etiam  
mortalium genere tot ac tantas ultro parit utilitates, ut  
mioresve non posset, si in primis et maxime esset ad  
am huius vitae, quae in terris degitur, prosperitatem instituta.  
egredientem rem publicam vestram atque in meliorem statum  
i itinere venientem, nemo non vidit: idque in iis etiam rebus  
religionem attingunt. Nam quemadmodum ingenti commo-  
n potentiaeque accessione, unius conversione saeculi, crevere  
es, ita Ecclesiam cernimus ex minima tenuissimaque mag-  
perceleriter effectam et egregie florentem. Iamvero si ex

una parte auctae opes copiaeque civitatum merito americani generis ingenio atque operosae sedulitati referuntur acceptae; ex altera florens rei catholicae conditio primum quidem virtuti, sollertiae, prudentiaeque tribuenda Episcoporum et Cleri: deinde vero fidei munificentiaeque catholicorum. Ita singulis ordinibus pro virili parte adnitentibus, licuit vobis res innumerabiles pie atque utiliter instituire; aedes sacras, ludos litterarios pueris instituendis, domicilia maiorum disciplinarum, domos hospitales plebi excipiundae, valetudinaria, coenobia. Quod vero propius ad culturam attinet animorum, quae christianarum exercitatione virtutum continetur, plura Nobis comperta sunt, quibus et spe erigimur et gaudio complemur: scilicet augeri gradatim utriusque ordinis Clericos: in honore esse pia collegia sodalium, vigere scholas *curiales catholicas*, scholas *dominicas* doctrinae christianae tradendae, scholas *aestivas*; consociationes ad suppetias mutuo ferendas, ad inopiam levandam, ad victus temperantiam tuendam: his accedere multa pietatis popularis argumenta.

Harum felicitati rerum non est dubium plurimum iussa ac decreta conducere Synodorum vestrarum, earum maxime, quas posteriore tempore Sedis Apostolicae vocavit et sanxit auctoritas. Sed praeterea, libet enim id fateri quod est, sua debetur gratia aequitati legum, quibus America vivit, moribusque bene constitutae rei publicae. Hoc enim Ecclesiae apud vos concessum est, non repugnante temperatione civitatis, ut nullis legum praepedita vinclis, contra vim defensa iure communi iustitiâque iudiciorum, tutam obtineat vivendi agendique sine offensione facultatem. Sed quamquam haec vera sunt, tamen error tollendus, ne quis hinc sequi existimet, petendum ab America exemplum optimi Ecclesiae status: aut universe licere vel expedire, rei civilis reique sacrae distractas esse dissociatasque, more americano, rationes. Quod enim incolumis apud vos res est catholica, quod prosperis etiam auctibus crescit, id omnino fecunditati tribuendum, qua divinitus pollet Ecclesia, quaeque si nullus adversetur, si nulla res impedimento sit, se sponte effert atque effundit; longe tamen uberioribus editura fructus, si, praeter libertatem, gratiâ legum fruatur patrocinioque publicae potestatis.

Nos vero, quoad per tempora licuit, conservare ac fundare firmius rem catholicam apud vos, numquam praetermisimus.—Hac de caussa duas potissimum res, quod probe nostis, aggressi sumus: alteram, provehere studia doctrinarum: alteram, rei catholicae efficere administrationem plenioram. Scilicet etsi universitatis studiorum domicilia plura numerabantur, eaque insignia, faciendum tamen duximus, ut unum aliquod existeret Sedis Apostolicae auctoritate institutum, idemque omni iure legitimo a Nobis auctum; in quo doctores catholici studiosos sciendi erudirent, prin-

io quidem philosophicis ac theologicis, deinde vero, ubi res et tempora siverint, ceteris quoque disciplinis, iis nominatim quas vestra aut peperit aut perfecit aetas. Omnis enim eruditio manca, si nulla recentiorum disciplinarum accesserit cognitio. Videbitur et in hoc tam celeri ingeniorum cursu, in tanta cupiditate sciendi non late fusa, eademque per se laudabili atque honesta, anteire et catholicos homines, non subsequi: ideoque instruant se oportet ab omni elegantia doctrinae, acriterque exerceant animum exploratione veri, et totius, quoad potest, indagatione naturæ. Quod omni tempore idem Ecclesia voluit: ob eamque rem ad conferendos scientiarum fines omnino tantum conferre consuevit, quantum opera et contentione potuit. Igitur per litteras die VII Martii an. MDCCCLXXXIX ad vos, Venerabiles Fratres, datas Gymnasium magnum cupidae maiorum disciplinarum iuventuti rite instituimus Washingtoni, in urbe principe; quam quidem peropportunitatem fore sedem studiis optimis, vosmetipsi maximo numero confirmastis. De qua re ad venerabiles fratres Nostros S. R. E. Cardinales cum referremus in Consistorio,<sup>1</sup> velle Nos declaravimus, ut instar eo in gymnasio haberi, ut eruditio et doctrina coniungatur cum incolumitate fidei, neque minus ad religionem quam ad vires optimas informetur adolescentes. Idcirco rectae studiorum rationi, ac disciplinae alumnorum tuendae praeesse iussimus foederatarum civitatum Episcopos, collata Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi Cancellarii, ut loquantur, potestate ac munere.—Et initia huiusmodi, Dei beneficio, satis laeta. Nulla enim interiecta mora, non saecularia sollemnia ob memoriam ecclesiasticae Hierarchiae meritis, exorsae faustis ominibus, praesente Legato Nostro, sacrae disciplinae. Ex eoque tempore elaborare novimus in tradenda theologia spectatos viros, quorum ingenii doctrinaeque laus insigni a Sede Apostolicam fide observantiæque cumulatur.—Neque hoc diu est, cum rescivimus, pii sacerdotis liberalitate extructas inchoato aedes scientiis litterisque tradendis, clericorum simul et laicorum commodo adolescentium. E cuius viri exemplo facile confidimus sumpturos, quod imitentur, cives: non enim nota Nobis indoles Americanorum; neque fugere eos potest, quicquid in ea re collocetur liberalitatis, cum maximis in commune civitatibus compensari.

Ex huiusmodi Lyceis, quae variis temporibus Ecclesia romana ipsamet princeps instituit, aut instituta probavit legibusque regit, nemo est nescius quanta in omnem Europam et doctrinæ gloria et vis humanitatis effluxerit. Hodieque, ut sileamus de ceteris, satis est Lovaniense meminisse: ex quo universa Belgarum incrementa petit prosperitatis et gloriae prope quotidiana.

<sup>1</sup> Die xxx, Decembr, an. MDCCCLXXXIX.

Iamvero par ac similis copia utilitatum facile est a magno Lyceo Washingtoniensi consecutura, si doctores pariter atque alumni, quod minime dubitamus, praeceptis Nostris paruerint, iidemque, amotis partium studiis et contentionibus, opinionem sibi a populo, a Clero conciliarint.

Caritati vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, ac beneficentiae populari commendatum hoc loco volumus Collegium urbanum adolescentibus ex America septentrionali ad sacra fingendis, quod Pius IX. decessor Noster condidit, quodque ipsum Nos, per litteras die xxv. Octobri mense an. MDCCCLXXXIV. datas, constitutione legitima firmandum curavimus: eo vel maxime quod communem de ipso expectationem haud sane fefellit exitus. Testes estis vosmetipsi, non longo temporis decursu, complures inde extitisse sacerdotes bonos, in iisque nec deesse qui maximos sacrae dignitatis gradus virtute adepti doctrinaque sint. Quare vos omnino arbitramur facturos operae pretium, si perrexeritis lectos adolescentes huc mittere in spem Ecclesiae instituendos: quas enim et ingenii opes et animi virtutes in romana urbe paraverint, eas aliquando explicabunt domi, atque in communem afferent utilitatem.

Simili modo vel inde a Pontificatus exordio caritate permoti, qua catholicos e gente vestra complectimur, de Concilio Baltimorensi III. cogitare coepimus. Cumque serius Archiepiscopi, eius rei caussâ, Romam invitatu Nostro istinc advenissent, diligenter ab ipsis, quid in commune consulendum censerent, exquisivimus: postremo quod universis Baltimoram convocatis visum est decernere, id matura consideratione adhibita, ratum esse auctoritate apostolica iussimus. Celeriter autem apparuit operae fructus. Quandoquidem Baltimorensia consulta, salutaria et valde accommodata temporibus res ipsa comprobavit, comprobat. Satis iam eorum perspecta vis est ad stabiliendam disciplinam, ad excitandam Cleri sollertiam ac vigilantiam, ad catholicam adolescentis aetatis institutionem tuendam et propagandam.—Quamquam his in rebus si vestram, Venerabiles Fratres, agnoscimus industriam, si collaudamus iunctam cum prudentia constantiam, merito vestro facimus: propterea quod plane intelligimus, talium ubertatem bonorum nequaquam ad maturitatem tam celeriter atque expedite perventuram fuisse, si vosmetipsi, quae sapienter ad Baltimoram statueratis, ea non sedulo et fideliter exsequi, quantum in sua quisque potestate erat, studuissetis.

Verum absoluto Baltimorensi concilio, reliqua pars erat ut congruens et conveniens quasi fastigium imponeretur operi: quod impetrari vidimus vix posse melius, quam si Apostolica Sedes legationem americanam rite constituisset; eam itaque, ut nostis, rite constituimus. Atque hoc facto, quemadmodum alias docuimus, primum quidem testari placuit, in iudicio benevolentiaque

tra eodem Americam loco et iure esse, quo ceterae sunt, praeter magnae atque imperiosae, civitates. Deinde illud quoque cavimus, ut officiorum et necessitudinum, quae vos, quae totinum millia catholicorum cum Apostolica Sede continent, sint coniunctiora nexa. Revera multitudo catholicorum rem a se peractam intellexit, quam sicut saluti sibi sentiebat fore, ita cetera in more positam institutoque Sedis Apostolicae cognovit. Videlicet romani Pontifices, ob hanc causam quod rei christianae administrandae divinitus tenent principatum, suos peregratos ad gentes populosque christianos mittere vel ab ultima civitate consueverunt. Id autem non extrinsecus quaesito, sed suo iure suo, quia "romanus Pontifex, cui contulit Christus potestatem ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos Pastores et fideles,<sup>1</sup> cum per se singulas regiones circuire non possit, nec circa gregem credendum curam pastoralis sollicitudinis exercere, necesse est interdum *ex debito impositae servitutis*, suos ad diversas loca partes, prout necessitates emergerint, destinare legatos, qui *ius supplendo*, errata corrigant, aspera in plana convertant et commissis sibi populis salutis incrementa ministrent."<sup>2</sup> Quae vero quam iniusta et falsa suspicio, si qua foret uspiam, mandata Legato potestatem potestati officere episcoporum. Mandata Nobis, ut nulli magis, eorum iura sunt, quos *Spiritus sanctus posuit episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei*, eaque permanere integra in omni gente, atque in omni regione terrarum et volumus et velle debemus: praesertim quod singulorum dignitas episcoporum cum potestate romani pontificis ita naturâ contextitur, ut alteri necessarios consulat, qui alteram tueatur. *Meus honor est honor universae ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*<sup>3</sup> Quare Legati Apostolici, qualicumque demum potestate fungantur, cum haec persona atque hae partes sint, Pontificis a quo mandata facere et voluntatem interpretari, tantum abest ut ordinariae potestati episcoporum quicquam pariat detrimenti, ut minus firmamentum ac robur sit allaturus. Eius quippe auctoritas non parum est habitura ponderis ad conservandam in multis obedientiam; in Clero disciplinam debitamque Episcopis concordantiam; in Episcopis caritatem mutuam cum intima animoconiunctione.—Quae quidem tam salutaris tamque expetenda functio, cum in hoc potissimum sita sit et sentire concorditer agere, plane efficiet, ut quisque vestrum in administratione rei christianae suae diligenter versari pergat: nemo alterum in re-

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Vat. Sess. iv., c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. un Extravag. Comm., *De Consuet.*, l. I.

<sup>3</sup> S. Gregorius, *Epist. ad Eulog.*, Alex. lib. viii., ep. 30.

gundo impediat; de alterius consiliis actisque nemo quaerat; universique, sublatis dissidiis retinendâque invicem observantiâ, provehere Ecclesiae americanae decus et commune bonum summa virium conspiratione nitamini. Ex qua Episcoporum concordia dici vix potest quanta non modo salus in nostros manabit, sed et in reliquos vis exempli; quippe qui facile vel hoc ipso argumento perspicient in Episcoporum catholicorum ordinem vere divinum apostolatum hereditate transisse.— Est praeterea aliud magnopere considerandum. Consentiunt prudentes viri, quod nosmetipsi paulo ante indicavimus, nec sane inviti, reservatam ad maiora Americam videri. Atqui huius, quae prospicitur, magnitudinis participem eandemque adiutricem Ecclesiam catholicam volumus. Nimirum ius esse atque oportere iudicamus, eam una cum republica pleno gradu ad meliora contendere, utendis videlicet opportunitatibus, quas afferat dies: eodemque tempore dare operam, ut virtute institutisque suis prosit quam maxime potest incrementis civitatum. Sed omnino utrumque est tanto facilius cumulatusque consecutura, quanto constitutam melius futura tempora offenderint. Iamvero quid sibi vult legatio, de qua loquimur, aut quid spectat tamquam finem, nisi hoc efficere, ut Ecclesiae sit constitutio firmitior, disciplina munitior?

Quod ita cum sit, valde velimus hoc in animos catholicorum quotidie altius descendat, nec sibi privatim consulere se posse rectius, nec de salute communi melius mereri, quam si Ecclesiae subesse atque obtemperare toto animo perrexerint.

Quamquam hac illi in re vix indigent hortatione: solent enim sua sponte et laudabili constantia ad instituta catholica adhaerescere. Rem unam eamque maximi momenti et saluberrimam in omnes partes libet recordari hoc loco, quae fide moribusque sancte apud vos, uti aequum est, generatim retinetur: dogma christianum dicimus de unitate et perpetuitate coniugii: in quo non societati dumtaxat domesticae, sed etiam coniunctioni hominum civili maximum suppeditat vinculum incolumitatis. De civibus vestris, de iis ipsis qui nobiscum cetera dissident, catholicam hac de re doctrinam catholicumque morem non pauci mirantur ac probant videlicet perterriti licentia divortiorum. Quod cum ita iudicant, non minus caritate patriae ducuntur, quam sapientiâ consilii. Vix enim cogitari potest capitalior civitati pestis, quam velle, dirimi posse vinculum, divina lege perpetuum atque individuum. Divortiorum "caussâ fiunt maritalia foedera mutabilia: extenuatur mutua benevolentia: infidelitati perniciose incitamenta suppeditantur: tuitioni atque institutioni liberorum nocetur: dissuendis societatibus domesticis praebetur occasio: discordiarum inter familias semina sparguntur: minuitur ac deprimitur dignitas mulierum, quae in periculum veniunt ne, cum libidini virorum inservierint, pro

tis habeantur. Et quoniam ad perdendas familias, frangendo regnorum opes nihil tam valet quam corruptela morum, perspicitur prosperitati familiarum ac civitatum maxime iniuncte divortia."

verum genere civili, compertum est atque exploratum, in re praesertim populari, cuiusmodi vestra est, quanti referat esse ac bene moratos cives. In libera civitate, nisi iusculgo colatur, nisi saepius ac diligenter ad evangelicarum nota legum multitudo revocetur, potest ipsa esse pernicioasa. Quotquot igitur ex ordine Cleri in erudienda multitudo laborant, hunc locum de officiis civium enucleate pertractandum id persuasum penitusque comprehensum animo habeant, ut, in omni munere vitae civilis fidem praestari, abstinentiam, civitatem oportere: quod enim privatis in rebus non licet, id publicis licere. De hoc genere toto in ipsis encyclicis litteris, Pontificatu maximo subinde conscripsimus, complura, ut praesto sunt, quae sequantur et quibus pareant catholici. Item humanam, praecipua christianorum officia, principatum, civitatum constitutionem christianam scribendo edisserentattigimus, depromptis cum ex evangelica doctrina, tum ex principiis. Qui igitur esse cives probi volunt et in officiis eam fide versari, facile sumant ex litteris Nostris formamatis.—Simili modo insistant sacerdotes Concilii Baltimore III statuta ad populum meminisse: ea maxime quae de temperantiae sunt, de catholica adolescentium institutione, euenti sacramentorum usu, de obtemperacione iustis legibus isque reipublicae.

neundis quoque societatibus, diligentissime videndum ne errore fallatur. Atque hoc intelligi nominatim de opificibus is: quibus profecto coire in sodalitia, utilitatum sibi comparum gratiâ, ius est, libente Ecclesia, nec repugnante nated vehementer interest, quibuscum sese coniungant, ne ubi meliorum adiumenta requirunt, ibi in discrimen vocentur m multo maximorum. Huius discriminis maxima cautio secum ipsi statuunt, numquam commissuros ut ullo temlâve in re iustitia deseratur. Si qua igitur societas est, personis regatur non recti tenacibus, non religioni amicis, obnoxie pareat, obesse plurimum publice et privatim prodesset non potest. Maneat ergo, quod consequens est, modo fugere consociationes oportere, Ecclesiae iudicio aperte cas, sed eas etiam, quae prudentium virorum maximeque porum sententiâ, suspectae periculosaeque habeantur.

<sup>1</sup> Enc., *Arcanum*.



Imo vero, quod est valde ad fidei incolumitatem conducibile, malle catholici debent cum catholicis congregari, nisi fieri secus coegerit necessitas. Sibi vero inter se societate conglobatis praeesse sacerdotes aut laicos probos atque auctoritate graves iubeant iisque consilio praeceuntibus, consulere ac perficere pacate nitantur quod expedire rationibus suis videatur, ad normam potissimum praeceptorum, quae Nos litteris encyclicis *Rerum novarum* consignavimus. Hoc vero numquam sidi patiantur excidere, vindicari et in tuto poni iura multitudinis rectum esse atque optabile, verumtamen non praetermittendis officiis. Officia vero permagna ea esse, aliena non tangere; singulos esse sinere ad suas res liberos; quominus operam suam collocare queat ubi libet et quando libet, prohibere neminem. Quae per vim et turbas facta superiore anno vidistis in patria, satis admonent americanis etiam rebus audaciam immanitatemque perduellium imminere. Ipsa igitur tempora catholicos iubent pro tranquillitate contendere rerum communium, ideoque observare leges, abhorrere a vi, nec plura petere quam vel aequitas vel iustitia patiatur.

Has ad res multum sane conferre operae possunt, qui se ad scribendum contulere, maxime quorum in commentariis quotidianis insumitur labor. Haud latet Nos, multos iam in hac palaestra desudare bene exercitatos, quorum laudanda magis est, quam excitanda industria. Verumtamen legendi noscendique cupiditas cum tam vehemens sit apud vos ac tam late pertineat, cumque bonorum iuxta ac malorum maximum possit esse principium, omni ope enitendum, ut eorum numerus augeatur, qui scribendi munus scienter atque animo optimo gerant, religione duce, probitate comite. Atque id eo magis apparet in America necessarium propter consuetudinem usumque catholicorum cum alienis catholico nomine: quae certe caussa est quamobrem nostris summa animi provisione constantiâque singulari sit opus. Erudiri eos necesse est, admoneri, confirmari animo, incitari ad studia virtutum, ad officia erga Ecclesiam, in tantis offensionum caussis, fideliter servanda. Ista quidem curare atque in istis elaborare, munus est Cleri proprium idemque permagnum: sed tamen a scriptoribus ephemeridum et locus et tempus postulat, idem ut ipsi contentur, eademque pro caussa, quoad possunt, contendant. Serio tamen considerent, scribendi operam, si minus obfuturam, parum certe religioni profuturam, deficiente animorum idem petentium concordia. Qui Ecclesiae servire utiliter, qui catholicum nomen ex animo tueri scribendo expetunt, summo consensu, ac prope contractis copiis oportet dinicere: ut plane non tam repellere, quam inferre bellum, si qui vires discordiâ dissipant, videntur.—Non absimili ratione operam suam ex frugifera et fructuosa

osam calamitosamque scriptores convertunt, quotiescumque  
ia vel acta episcoporum ad suum revocare iudicium ausint,  
âque verecundiâ debitâ, carpere, reprehendere: ex quo non  
nt quanta perturbatio ordinis, quot mala gignantur. Ergo  
nerint officii, ac iustos modestiae fines ne transilient. In ex-  
auctoritatis gradu collocatis obtemperandum Episcopis est,  
veniens consentaneusque magnitudini ac sanctitati muneris  
dus honos. Istam vere reverentiam, "quam praetermittere  
emini, maxime in catholicis ephemeridum auctoribus lucu-  
n esse et velut expositam ad exemplum necesse est. Ephe-  
es enim ad longe lateque pervagandum natae, in obvii cui-  
manus quotidie veniunt, et in opinionibus moribusque mul-  
tis non parum possunt."<sup>1</sup> Multa multis locis Nosmetipsi  
icio scriptoris boni praecepimus: multa item et a Concilio  
norensi III., et ab Archiepiscopis qui Chigagum anno  
CLXXXIII. convenerant, de communi sententia sunt renovata.  
modi igitur documenta et Nostra et vestra habeant notata  
catholici, atque ita statuunt, universam scribendi rationem  
n dirigi oportere, si probe fungi officio volunt, ut velle  
t.

reliquos iam cogitatio convertitur, qui nobiscum de fide  
iana dissentiunt: quorum non paucos quis neget hereditate  
, quam voluntate dissentire? Ut simus de eorum salute sol-  
quo animi ardore velimus ut in Ecclesiae complexum, com-  
s omnium matris, aliquando restituantur, Epistola Nostra  
tolica *Præclara* novissimo tempore declaravit. Nec sane  
uimur omni spe: is enim praesens respicit, cui parent omnia,  
e animam posuit ut *filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret*  
*um.*<sup>2</sup> Certe non eos deserere, non relinquere menti suae debe-  
sed lenitate et caritate maxima trahere ad nos, omnibus  
s persuadendo, ut inducant animum introspicere in omnes  
nae catholicae partes, praeiudicatasque opiniones exuere.  
n re si episcoporum Clerique universi primae sunt partes,  
dae sunt laicorum: quippe quorum in potestate est adjuvare  
olicam Cleri contentionem probitate morum, integrate vitae.  
pli magna vis est, in iis potissimum qui veritatem ex animo  
runt, honestatemque propter quamdam virtutis indolem con-  
tur, cuiusmodi in civibus vestris numerantur perplures.  
tianarum spectaculum virtutum si in obcaecatis inveterata  
stitutione ethnicis tantum potuit, quantum litterarum monu-

*Cognita Nobis* ad Archiepp. et Epp. Provinciarum Taurinen. Mediolanen.  
en. XXV. Ian. an. MDCCCLXXXII.  
XI., 52.

menta testantur, num in iis, qui sunt christianis initiati sacris, nihil ad evellendum errorem posse censebimus?

Denique nec eos praetermittere silentio possumus, quorum, diuturna infelicitas opem a viris apostolicis implorat et exposcit. Indos intelligimus et Nigritas, americanis comprehensos finibus, qui maximam partem nondum superstitionis depulere tenebras. Quantus ad excolendum ager! quanta hominum multitudo partis per Iesum Christum impertienda beneficiis!

Interea caelestium munerum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis Venerabiles Fratres, et Clero populoque vestro, Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die vi. Ianuarii, Epiphania Domini, An. MDCCCXCV., Pontificatus Nostri decimo septimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

## TRANSLATION OF THE ENCYCLICAL.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN THE ARCHBISHOPS AND  
BISHOPS OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH  
AMERICA, LEO XIII., POPE.

*Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction:*

As we traverse in spirit and thought the wide expanse of ocean; although we have at other times addressed you in writing—especially when we directed Encyclical letters to the bishops of the Catholic world—yet have we now resolved to speak to you separately, trusting that we shall be, God willing, of some assistance to the Catholic cause amongst you. To this we apply ourselves with the utmost zeal and care; because we highly esteem and love exceedingly the young and vigorous American nation, in which we can plainly discern latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and of Christianity.

Not long ago, when your whole nation, as was fitting, celebrated, with grateful recollection and every manifestation of joy, the completion of the fourth century since the discovery of America, we, too, commemorated together with you that most precious event, sharing in your rejoicings with equal good will. Were we on that occasion content with offering prayers at a distance for your welfare and greatness. It was our wish to be in person present with you in your festivities. Hence we had fully sent one who should represent our person. Not without good reason did we take part in your celebration. For when America was, as yet, but a new-born babe, uttering in its cradle its feeble cries, the Church took it to her bosom and motherly care. Columbus, as we have elsewhere expressly shown, was, as the primary fruit of his voyages and labors, to open a way for the Christian faith into new lands and new seas. Holding this thought constantly in view, his first solicitude, when he disembarked, was to plant upon the shore the sacred emblem of the Cross. Wherefore, like as the Ark of Noe, surmounting the overflowing waters, bore the seed of Israel together with the remnants of the human race, even thus did the barks launched by Columbus upon the ocean carry into regions beyond the seas all the germs of mighty states as the principles of the Catholic religion.

This is not the place to give a detailed account of what there-

upon ensued. Very rapidly did the light of the Gospel shine upon the savage tribes discovered by the Ligurian. For it is sufficiently well known how many of the children of Francis, as well as of Dominic and of Loyola, were accustomed during the two following centuries to voyage thither for this purpose; how they cared for the colonies brought over from Europe; but primarily and chiefly how they converted the natives from superstition to Christianity, sealing their labors in many instances with the testimony of their blood. The names newly given to so many of your towns and rivers, and mountains and lakes, teach and clearly witness how deeply your beginnings were marked with the foot-prints of the Catholic Church.

Nor, perchance, did the fact which we now recall take place without some design of Divine Providence. Precisely at the epoch when the American colonies, having, with Catholic aid, achieved liberty and independence, coalesced into a constitutional Republic the ecclesiastical hierarchy was happily established amongst you; and at the very time when the popular suffrage placed the great Washington at the helm of the Republic, the first bishop was set by apostolic authority over the American Church. The well-known friendship and familiar intercourse which subsisted between these two men seems to be an evidence that the United States ought to be conjoined in concord and amity with the Catholic Church. And not without cause; for without morality the state cannot endure—a truth which that illustrious citizen of yours, whom we have just mentioned, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius and statesmanship, perceived and proclaimed. But the best and strongest support of morality is Religion. She, by her very nature, guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded, and, setting before us the motives most powerful to influence us, commands us to live virtuously and forbids us to transgress. Now, what is the Church other than a legitimate society, founded by the will and ordinance of Jesus Christ for the preservation of morality and the defence of religion? For this reason have we repeatedly endeavored, from the summit of the pontifical dignity, to inculcate that the Church whilst directly and immediately aiming at the salvation of souls and the beatitude which is to be attained in heaven, is yet, even in the order of temporal things, the fountain of blessings so numerous and great that they could not have been greater or more numerous had the original purpose of her institution been the pursuit of happiness during the life which is spent on earth.

That your Republic is progressing and developing by giant strides, is patent to all; and this holds good in religious matters also. For even as your cities, in the course of one century, have



de a marvelous increase in wealth and power, so do we behold e Church, from scant and slender beginnings, grown with idity to be great and exceedingly flourishing. Now, if, on the e hand, the increased riches and resources of your cities are tly attributed to the talents and active industry of the American ple, on the other hand, the prosperous condition of Catholicity ust be ascribed, first, indeed, to the virtue, the ability and the adence of the bishops and clergy; but, in no slight measure o, to the faith and generosity of the Catholic laity. Thus, while e different classes exerted their best energies, you were enabled erect unnumbered religious and useful institutions, sacred edies, schools for the instruction of youth, colleges for the higher anches, homes for the poor, hospitals for the sick, and convents d monasteries. As for what more closely touches spiritual inter- s, which are based upon the exercise of Christian virtues, many ts have been brought to our notice, whereby we are animated h hope and filled with joy, namely, that the numbers of the ular and regular clergy are steadily augmenting, that pious so- ities and confraternities are held in esteem, that the Catholic rochial schools, the Sunday-schools for imparting Christian doc- ne and Summer schools are in a flourishing condition; more- er, associations for mutual aid, for the relief of the indigent, for e promotion of temperate living, add to all this the many evi- nces of popular piety.

The main factor, no doubt, in bringing things into this happy te, were the ordinances and decrees of your Synods, especially those which in more recent times were convened and confirmed the authority of the Apostolic See. But, moreover (a fact ich it gives pleasure to acknowledge), thanks are due to the vity of the laws which obtain in America and to the customs of e well-ordered Republic. For the Church amongst you, un- posed by the Constitution and Government of your nation, fet- ed by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the mmon laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live d act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be ught the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that tholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecun- y with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which less men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands d propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant

fruits, if in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.

For our part we have left nothing undone, as far as circumstances permitted, to preserve and more solidly establish amongst you the Catholic religion. With this intent, we have, as you are well aware, turned our attention to two special objects; first, the advancement of learning; second, a perfecting of methods in the management of Church affairs. There already, indeed, existed several distinguished universities. We, however, thought it advisable that there should be one founded by authority of the Apostolic See and endowed by us with all suitable powers, in which Catholic professors might instruct those devoted to the pursuit of learning. The design was to begin with philosophy and theology, adding, as means and circumstances would allow, the remaining branches, those particularly, which the present age has introduced or perfected. An education cannot be deemed complete which takes no notice of modern sciences. It is obvious that in the existing keen competition of talents, and the widespread and, in itself, noble and praiseworthy passion for knowledge, Catholics ought to be, not followers, but leaders. It is necessary, therefore, that they should cultivate every refinement of learning, and zealously train their minds to the discovery of truth and the investigation, so far as it is possible, of the entire domain of nature. This, in every age, has been the desire of the Church; upon the enlargement of the boundaries of the sciences has she been wont to bestow all possible labor and energy. By a letter, therefore, dated the seventh day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1889, directed to you, venerable brethren, we established at Washington, your capital city, esteemed by a majority of you a very proper seat for the higher studies, a University for the instruction of young men desirous of pursuing advanced courses. In announcing this matter to our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, in Consistory, we expressed the wish that it should be regarded as the fixed law of the University to unite erudition and learning with soundness of faith and to imbue its students not less with religion than with scientific culture. To the Bishops of the United States we entrusted the task of establishing a suitable Course of Studies and of supervising the discipline of the students; and we conferred the office and authority of Chancellor, as it is called, upon the Archbishop of Baltimore. And, by Divine favor, a quite happy beginning was made. For, without any delay, whilst you were celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of your ecclesiastical Hierarchy, under the brightest auspices, in the presence of our Delegate, the divinity classes were

ned. From that time onward, we know that theological science has been imparted by the diligence of eminent men, the renown of whose talents and learning receives a fitting crown in their recognized loyalty and devotion to the Apostolic See. Nor is it long since we were apprised that, thanks to the liberality of a pious prince, a new building had been constructed, in which young men, whether cleric as lay, are to receive instruction in the natural sciences and in literature. From our knowledge of the American character, we are fully confident that the example set by this noble prince will incite others of your citizens to imitate him; they will not fail to realize that liberality exercised towards such an object will be repaid by the very greatest advantages to the public.

No one can be ignorant how powerfully similar institutions of learning, whether originally founded by the Roman Church herself from time to time, or approved and promoted by her legislation, have contributed to the spread of knowledge and civilization in every part of Europe. Even in our own day, though other instances might be given, it is enough to mention the University of Louvain, to which the entire Belgian nation ascribes its almost daily increase in prosperity and glory. Equally abundant will be the benefits proceeding from the Washington University, if the professors and students (as we doubt not they will) be mindful of the injunctions, and shunning party spirit and strife, conciliate the divided opinion of the people and the clergy.

We wish now, Venerable Brethren, to commend to your affection and to the generosity of your people the College which our predecessor, Pius IX., founded in this city for the ecclesiastical training of young men from North America, and which we took pleasure to place upon a firm basis by a letter dated the twenty-fifth of October, in the year of our Lord 1884. We can make this appeal the more confidently, because the results obtained from this institution have by no means belied the expectations commonly entertained regarding it. You yourselves can testify that, during its brief existence, it has sent forth a very large number of exemplary priests, some of whom have been promoted for their virtue and learning to the highest degrees of ecclesiastical dignity. We are therefore, thoroughly persuaded that you will continue to be anxious to send hither select young men who are in training to become the hope of the Church. For they will carry back to their homes and utilize for the general good the wealth of intellectual attainments and moral excellence which they shall have acquired in the city of Rome.

The love which we cherish towards the Catholics of your nation has led us, likewise, to turn our attention at the very beginning of our Pontificate, to the convocation of a third Plenary Council of



Baltimore. Subsequently, when the archbishops, at our invitation, had come to Rome, we diligently inquired from them what they deemed most conducive to the common good. We finally, and after mature deliberation, ratified by Apostolic authority the decrees of the prelates assembled at Baltimore. In truth the event has proven, and still proves, that the decrees of Baltimore were salutary and timely in the extreme. Experience has demonstrated their power for the maintenance of discipline; for stimulating the intelligence and zeal of the clergy; for defending and developing the Catholic education of youth. Wherefore, venerable brethren, if we make acknowledgment of your activity in these matters, if we laud your firmness tempered with prudence, we but pay tribute due to your merit; for we are fully sensible that so great a harvest of blessings could by no means have so swiftly ripened to maturity, had you not exerted yourselves, each to the utmost of his ability, sedulously and faithfully to carry into effect the statutes you had wisely framed at Baltimore.

But when the Council of Baltimore had concluded its labors, the duty still remained of putting, so to speak, a proper and becoming crown upon the work. This, we perceived, could scarcely be done in a more fitting manner than through the due establishment by the Apostolic See of an American Legation. Accordingly, as you are well aware, we have done this. By this action, as we have elsewhere intimated, we have wished, first of all, to certify that in our judgment and affection, America occupies the same place and rights as other States, be they ever so mighty and imperial. In addition to this we had in mind to draw more closely the bonds of duty and friendship which connect you and so many thousands of Catholics with the Apostolic See. In fact, the mass of the Catholics understood how salutary our action was destined to be; they saw, moreover, that it accorded with the usage and policy of the Apostolic See. For it has been, from earliest antiquity, the custom of the Roman Pontiffs in the exercise of the divinely-bestowed gift of the primacy in the administration of the Church of Christ to send forth legates to Christian nations and peoples. And they did this, not by an adventitious but an inherent right. For "the Roman Pontiff, upon whom Christ has conferred ordinary and immediate jurisdiction, as well over all and singular the churches, as over all and singular pastors and faithful,"<sup>1</sup> since he cannot personally visit the different regions and thus exercise the pastoral office over the flock intrusted to him, finds it necessary, from time to time, in the discharge of the ministry imposed on him, to dispatch legates into different parts of the world, accord-

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Vat. Sess., iv., c. 3.

as the need arises; who, supplying his place, may correct errors, make the rough ways plain, and administer to the people confided to their care increased means of salvation."<sup>1</sup>

But how unjust and baseless would be the suspicion, should it anywhere exist, that the powers conferred on the legate are an obstacle to the authority of the bishops! Sacred to us (more than to any other) are the rights of those "*whom the Holy Ghost has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God.*" That these rights should remain intact in every nation in every part of the globe, we both desire and ought to desire, the more so since the dignity of the individual bishop is by nature so interwoven with the dignity of the Roman pontiff that any measure which benefits the one necessarily protects the other. "My honor is the honor of the Universal Church. My honor is the unimpaired vigor of my brethren. Then am I truly honored, when to each one due honor is not denied."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, since it is the office and function of an apostolic legate, with whatsoever powers he may be vested, to execute the mandates and interpret the will of the pontiff who sends him, thus, so far from his being of any detriment to the ordinary power of the bishops, he will rather bring an accession of stability and strength. His authority will possess no slight weight for preserving in the multitude a submissive spirit; in the energy discipline and due reverence for the bishops and in the bishops mutual charity and an intimate union of souls. And since this union, so salutary and desirable, consists mainly in harmony of thought and action, he will, no doubt, bring it to pass that each one of you shall persevere in the diligent administration of his diocesan affairs; that one shall not impede another in matters of government; that one shall not pry into the counsels and conduct of another; finally, that with disagreements eradicated and mutual esteem maintained, you may all work together with combined energies to promote the glory of the American Church and the general welfare. It is difficult to estimate the good results which will flow from this concord of the bishops. Our own people will receive edification; and the force of example will have its effect on those without—who will be persuaded by this argument alone that the divine apostolate has been passed by inheritance to the ranks of the Catholic episcopate.

Another consideration claims our earnest attention. All intelligent men are agreed, and we ourselves have with pleasure intimated it above, that America seems destined for greater things. Now, it is our wish that the Catholic Church should not only be in, but help to bring about, this prospective greatness. We

<sup>1</sup> Cap. Un. Extrav. Comm. De Consuet. l. 1.

<sup>2</sup> S. Gregorius Epis. ad Eulog. Alex. lib. viii., ep. 30.

deem it right and proper that she should, by availing herself of the opportunities daily presented to her, keep equal step with the Republic in the march of improvement, at the same time striving to the utmost, by her virtue and her institutions, to aid in the rapid growth of the States. Now, she will attain both these objects the more easily and abundantly, in proportion to the degree in which the future shall find her constitution perfected. But what is the meaning of the legation of which we are speaking, or what is its ultimate aim except to bring it about that the constitution of the Church shall be strengthened, her discipline better fortified? Wherefore, we ardently desire that this truth should sink day by day more deeply into the minds of Catholics—namely, that they can in no better way safeguard their own individual interests and the common good than by yielding a hearty submission and obedience to the Church. Your faithful people, however, are scarcely in need of exhortation on this point; for they are accustomed to adhere to the institutions of Catholicity with willing souls and a constancy worthy of all praise.

To one matter of the first importance and fraught with the greatest blessings it is a pleasure at this place to refer, on account of the holy firmness in principle and practice respecting it which, as a rule, rightly prevails amongst you; we mean the Christian dogma of the unity and indissolubility of marriage; which supplies the firmest bond of safety, not merely to the family, but to society at large. Not a few of your citizens, even of those who dissent from us in other doctrines, terrified by the licentiousness of divorce, admire and approve in this regard the Catholic teaching and the Catholic customs. They are led to this judgment not less by love of country than by the wisdom of the doctrine. For difficult it is to imagine a more deadly pest to the community than the wish to declare dissoluble a bond which the law of God has made perpetual and inseverable. Divorce "is the fruitful cause of mutable marriage contracts; it diminishes mutual affection; it supplies a pernicious stimulus to unfaithfulness; it is injurious to the care and education of children; it gives occasion to the breaking up of domestic society; it scatters the seeds of discord among families; it lessens and degrades the dignity of women, who incur the danger of being abandoned when they shall have subserved the lust of their husbands. And since nothing tends so effectually as the corruption of morals to ruin families and undermine the strength of kingdoms, it may easily be perceived that divorce is especially hostile to the prosperity of families and States."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Encyc. Arcanum.*

As regards civil affairs, experience has shown how important it is that the citizens should be upright and virtuous. In a free State, unless justice be generally cultivated, unless the people be repeatedly and diligently urged to observe the precepts and laws of the Gospel, liberty itself may be pernicious. Let those of the clergy, therefore, who are occupied with the instruction of the multitude, treat plainly this topic of the duties of citizens, so that they may understand and feel the necessity, in political life, of conscientiousness, self-restraint and integrity; for that cannot be lawful in public which is unlawful in private affairs. On this whole subject there are to be found, as you know, in the encyclical letters written by us from time to time in the course of our pontificate, many things which Catholics should attend to and observe.

In these writings and expositions we have treated of human liberty, of the chief Christian duties, of civil government, and of the Christian constitution of States, drawing our principles as well from the teaching of the Gospels as from reason. They, therefore, who wish to be good citizens and discharge their duties faithfully may readily learn from our letters the ideal of an upright life. In like manner, let the priests be persistent in keeping before the minds of the people the enactments of the Third Council of Baltimore, particularly those which inculcate the virtue of temperance, the frequent use of the sacraments and the observance of the just laws and institutions of the Republic.

Now, with regard to entering societies, extreme care should be taken not to be ensnared by error. And we wish to be understood as referring in a special manner to the working classes, who assuredly have the right to unite in associations for the promotion of their interests; a right acknowledged by the Church and unopposed by nature. But it is very important to take heed with whom they are to associate; lest, whilst seeking aid for the improvement of their condition, they may be imperiling far weightier interests. The most effectual precaution against this peril is to determine with themselves at no time or in any matter to be parties to the violation of justice. Any society, therefore, which is ruled by and servilely obeys persons who are not steadfast for the right and friendly to religion is capable of being extremely prejudicial to the interests, as well of individuals as of the community; beneficial it cannot be. Let this conclusion, therefore, remain firm—to shun, not only those associations which have been openly condemned by the judgment of the Church, but those also which, in the opinion of intelligent men, and especially of the bishops, are regarded as suspicious and dangerous.

Nay rather, unless forced by necessity to do otherwise, Catholics ought to prefer to associate with Catholics, a course which

will be very conducive to the safeguarding of their faith. As presidents of societies thus formed among themselves, it would be well to appoint either priests or upright laymen of weight and character; guided by whose counsels, they should endeavor peacefully to adopt and carry into effect such measures as may seem most advantageous to their interests, keeping in view the rules laid down by us in our Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*. Let them, however, never allow this to escape their memory; that whilst it is proper and desirable to assert and secure the rights of the many, yet this is not to be done by a violation of duty; and that these are very important duties; not to touch what belongs to another; to allow every one to be free in the management of his own affairs; not to hinder any one to dispose of his services when he please and where he please. The scenes of violence and riot which you witnessed last year in your own country sufficiently admonish you that America, too, is threatened with the audacity and ferocity of the enemies of public order. The state of the times, therefore, bids Catholics to labor for the tranquility of the commonwealth, and for this purpose to obey the laws, abhor violence, and seek no more than equity or justice permits.

Towards these objects much may be contributed by those who have devoted themselves to writing, and in particular by those who are engaged on the daily press. We are aware that already there labor in this field many men of skill and experience, whose diligence demands words of praise rather than of encouragement. Nevertheless, since the thirst for reading and knowledge is so vehement and widespread amongst you, and since, according to circumstances, it can be productive either of good or evil, every effort should be made to increase the number of intelligent and well-disposed writers who take religion for their guide and virtue for their constant companion. And this seems all the more necessary in America, on account of the familiar intercourse and intimacy between Catholics and those who are estranged from the Catholic name, a condition of things which certainly exacts from our people great circumspection and more than ordinary firmness. It is necessary to instruct, admonish, strengthen and urge them on to the pursuit of virtue and to the faithful observance, amid so many occasions of stumbling, of their duties towards the Church. It is, of course, the proper function of the clergy to devote their care and energies to this great work: but the age and the country require that journalists should be equally zealous in this same cause, and labor in it to the full extent of their powers. Let them, however, seriously reflect that their writings, if not positively prejudicial to religion, will surely be of slight service to it unless in concord of minds they all seek the same end. They who de-

to be of real service to the Church, and with their pens partly to defend the Catholic cause, should carry on the conflict with perfect unanimity and, as it were, with serried ranks, for they rather inflict than repel war, if they waste their strength by discord. In like manner their work, instead of being profitable and fruitful, becomes injurious and disastrous whenever they presume to call before their tribunal the decisions and acts of bishops, and, setting off due reverence, cavil and find fault; not perceiving how great a disturbance of order, how many evils are thereby produced. Let them, then be mindful of their duty, and not overstep the proper limits of moderation. The bishops, placed in the lofty position of authority, are to be obeyed, and suitable honor befitting the magnitude and sanctity of their office should be paid them. Now, this reverence, "which it is lawful to no one to neglect," should of necessity be eminently conspicuous and exemplary in Catholic journalists. For journals, naturally circulating far and wide, come daily into the hands of everybody, and exert no small influence upon the opinions and morals of the multitude.<sup>1</sup>

We have ourselves, on frequent occasions, laid down many rules respecting the duties of a good writer; many of which were unanimously inculcated as well by the Third Council of Baltimore as by the archbishops in their meeting at Chicago, in the year 1893. Let Catholic writers, therefore, bear impressed on their minds our teachings on this point as well as yours; and let them resolve that their entire method of writing shall be thereby guided, if they indeed desire, as they ought to desire, to discharge their duty well.

Our thoughts now turn to those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith; and who shall deny that, with not a few of them, dissent is a matter rather of inheritance than of will? How solicitous we are of their salvation, with what ardor of soul we wish that they should be at length restored to the embrace of the Church, the common mother of all, our Apostolic Epistle, "*Præsentia*," has in very recent times declared. Nor are we destitute of hope; for He is present and hath a care Whom all things obey and Who laid down His life that He might "gather in one the children of God who were dispersed." (John, xi., 52.)

Surely we ought not to desert them nor leave them to their weaknesses; but with mildness and charity draw them to us, using every means of persuasion to induce them to examine closely every part of the Catholic doctrine, and to free themselves from preconceived notions. In this matter, if the first place belongs to the

---

Ep. *Cognita Nobis* ad Archiepp. et Epp. Provinciarum, Taurinen. Mediolanen. Vercellen, xxv., Jan. an, MDCCCI.XXXII.

bishops and clergy, the second belongs to the laity who have it in their power to aid the apostolic efforts of the clergy by the probity of their morals and the integrity of their lives. Great is the force of example ; particularly with those who are earnestly seeking the truth, and who, from a certain inborn virtuous disposition, are striving to live an honorable and upright life, to which class very many of your fellow-citizens belong. If the spectacle of Christian virtues exerted the powerful influence over the heathens blinded, as they were, by inveterate superstition, which the records of history attest, shall we think it powerless to eradicate error in the case of those who have been initiated into the Christian religion ?

Finally, we cannot pass over in silence those whose long-continued unhappy lot implores and demands succor from men of apostolic zeal ; we refer to the Indians and the negroes who are to be found within the confines of America, the greatest portion of whom have not yet dispelled the darkness of superstition. How wide a field for cultivation ! How great a multitude of human beings to be made partakers of the blessing derived through Jesus Christ !

Meanwhile, as a presage of heavenly graces and a testimony of our benevolence, we most lovingly in the Lord impart to you, venerable brethren, and to your clergy and people, our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, near St. Peter's on the sixth day of January, the Epiphany of the Lord, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, the seventeenth of our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

# IO XIII. AND THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA."

THE very day on which we write these lines (March 3rd) Leo XIII. begins the eighteenth year of his marvellous pontificate amid the applause of the entire civilized world. The Encyclical "Longinqua Oceani Spatia" lies before us; it is an object of the same time of our gratitude, of our respect, and of our admiration. We would equally make it the object of our study, and endeavor to penetrate, as well as possible, the profundity of its grand lessons. But, before considering in detail the paternal address which the supreme Pastor of the Church has condescended to his children beyond the seas, thereby giving them new proof of his "good will and solicitude,"<sup>1</sup> we feel indeed, we may say persuaded, by the advent of this happy day, to reverse in our turn "in spirit and thought the wide expanse of the ocean," and to turn our eyes toward the Vatican. We would enter the horizon of meditation, and ascend to the veritable fount of the sympathy and prayer which this glorious anniversary represents. This we find, both in the incomparable grandeur of a pontificate than which

" . . . no prouder height  
Lur'd on the climber."<sup>2</sup>

in the influence, as well as in the singular activity of the Pontificate of our day. Besides, these two considerations are the beacons of our investigation. They cannot but inspire us with deeper filial piety and joyful submission while treating truths coming from so high an authority.

Let us cast a rapid glance on the providential mission of the Vicar of Peter, which Leo XIII. occupies with such *éclat*, and in the same glance, include the grand results accomplished, during the past seventeen years, by the experienced hand which conducts the bark of the Fisherman.

## I.—RÔLE OF THE PAPACY IN CHURCH AND SOCIETY.

From the very beginning of Christianity, Catholic tradition has been inscribed upon the brow of the Church the sublime and touching inscription, "Sancta Mater Ecclesia." This glorious title is, indeed, founded in the very nature of the divine institution, but it

<sup>1</sup> All quotations found in this article, unless otherwise specified, are taken from the *Encyclical*.

<sup>2</sup> *ante, Purgatory*, xix., 110.



has also been established by the history of centuries, and ratified by the unanimous testimony of grateful nations. The same Catholic tradition has given the sweet and noble name of "*Father*, Pater Patrum, father of the fathers," to the one who represents in the highest degree on earth the primordial paternity of Him, "of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named."<sup>1</sup> The intimate connection between the two appellations is evident. They express the union of the two-fold work of God, between the Church of Christ and him who is her head, her representative in the full sense of the word, the depository, and even the source, of all the powers with which Christ has invested her. Yet more, this union is not a bringing together of two separable objects; but it is a perfect unity; the Church of Christ, such as she has in fact been established, cannot even be conceived without the successor of Peter, according to the telling expression of St. Francis of Sales, "the Church and the Pope *are one*," "*tout un*."

The Son of God created the Church after the image of the Virgin Mother, to communicate to humanity a new life of grace—to regenerate and readapt it to its proper dignity and its supernatural end. Thus, He has also given her an especial fecundity, making her the kingdom of divine light and life, viz., of divine truth, of divine authority, of divine grace. The Church is inundated with this divine light, luminous currents of it traverse and encompass her, and awake the joy and the enthusiasm of all those spirits who contemplate it without prejudice. This light comes from Christ, from God, from Him alone. The faith of the Church, the doctrine to be believed by every Christian, is the doctrine revealed by God; the laws of Christian morality, as the word implies it again, are the laws given by Christ, who alone is the "way, the truth, and the life." Finally, the God-man alone is our Redeemer, He is the only High Priest, the only Sanctifier of souls. And yet, all this divine light of the Church comes also from the Pope. It comes from him, as far as he is the instrument to transmit it. No, he is not the light illuminating the whole world, but he is "to give testimony of the light."<sup>2</sup> He is not the creator, not the producer of it, but he dispenses it, he brings it into action, and radiates it throughout the whole world. In founding His Church, Christ has first built its foundation, Peter, the Pope; He has filled this rock with divine light, with divine life; so to speak, He charged it with divine electricity, when He said to Peter: Be the spiritual father of all My children, communicate to them My divine life; beam forth My light, beam forth My authority, beam forth My grace; fill My house with it, confirm thy brethren with it,

<sup>1</sup> Eph., iii., 15.

<sup>2</sup> Jo., i., 18.

My flock with it. Draw it out from My heart, not once, but many times, in every century, at every hour, until the end of the world!

This is the sublime mission of the Papacy; this the divine light which surrounds it in all its splendor; this the very origin and foundation of the Pope's *fatherly* dignity, power and influence.

Nineteen hundred years have elapsed since the time when God placed the plenitude of the Church's power in the hands of Peter. "Pertransiit benefaciendo!" "Blessings have everywhere followed his path." In these two words the Holy Spirit has, by the mouth of the first Pope, described the earthly life of the Divine Messenger. Pertransiit benefaciendo! They trace also the history of the divine institution by which the Son of God perpetuates His visible presence on earth unto the end of time. To "renew all things in Christ";<sup>2</sup> to save souls, and procure for them their eternal good; to conduct men to the feet of Christ, where they may imbibe the sweet peace of conscience together with their true moral well-being; to point out to prince and people the way to heaven and the civilizing influence of the religion of the cross; "*omnibus omnia*,"<sup>3</sup> "all things for all men"; to be the father of the poor—this is the noble mission to which the Papacy must at all times be devoted. If Leo XIII. could say in our day that "the history of the Papacy is the history of the benefits which mankind owes to the Roman Pontiffs,"<sup>4</sup> he has merely repeated what many eminent Protestant historians, such as Macaulay, in England; Ranke, in Germany; Guizot, in France, had already written and demonstrated. To the mind of the latter, the history of civilization is simply the history of the Church and the Papacy; if they had existed, he says, "the entire world would have been given up to the control of brutal force." The interests of the Papacy have been at all times the interests of humanity, and the interests of humanity have ever been those of the Papacy.

This phenomenon gives us also the key to the history of our century. The Church alone, through her visible head, maintains and defends the divine dispensation in its integrity, and throughout all extension, against the *threefold fundamental error of modern times*.

These three errors tend to separate what, according to the eternal plan of God, should remain distinct but still united. *Rationalism* endeavors to divorce reason and faith; *liberalism* affirms the hostility of Church and State; *socialism* brings capital and labor into opposition to each other. Now the teaching of the Church on these vital subjects has never varied. She establishes

<sup>1</sup> Eph., x., 38.

<sup>2</sup> Eph., i., 10.

<sup>3</sup> I. Cor., ix., 22.

<sup>4</sup> Letter addressed to Cardinals de Luca, Pitra, Hergenröther, 18th August, 1883.

the concordance of reason and more faith, the good feeling between Church and State, the harmony between capital and labor. Every effort on the part of a people to act in conformity to this divine plan has been blessed and recompensed; on the contrary, every revolt against the same providential ordinance has been punished. As the "soul of man is naturally Christian," so also is the soul of nations. In every branch of human activity; in every system, be it scientific, political or social; in public and in private life, we shall find the verification of the words: "Sine me nihil potestis facere."<sup>1</sup> "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God!"<sup>2</sup> Such was Peter's declaration, and such is to-day the declaration of the Pope. Uttered, then, for the first time by Peter, it will ever resound in all times and in all climes, since the Pope is the head of the Church for no other reason than to proclaim this truth to the world!

## II.—THE PONTIFICATE OF LEO XIII.

Our epoch is more apt than any other to appreciate the truth of this observation. The prevailing errors seem to have passed their maturity, if we may so express it, and have reached the climax of their evolution. We may perceive with the naked eye their veritable character and their fatal and impending sequences. Rationalism is about to end with what Mr. Brunetière, in the "*Revue des Deux Mondes*," has lately called "*la banqueroute de la science*," "the bankruptcy of science." The same "*Revue*" has proclaimed the final downfall of the "*immortelles conquêtes*," of 1789, of the so-called "rights of man," in opposition to divine right. Socialism forbodes a régime of tyranny, such as even the pagan world has never known. Hence the Church, faithful to her mission, as also to her character of universal teacher, becomes even more precise in expounding her doctrine, and redoubles her solicitude in her admonitions.

The late Cardinal Manning, when considering the number and the importance of the imposing lessons coming from the chair of Peter during the last eighty years, was wont to say: "The nineteenth century shall be known in history as the century of pontifical acts." And, surely, it would be extremely difficult to find a period in ecclesiastical history wherein the vigilance and apostolic prodigality of the popes have shown a greater activity. In this respect the reign of Leo XIII. will compare with those of Pius VI., Pius VII., Gregory XVI., and even with that of the great and immortal Pius IX.

We seldom meet with a man who already in his life is entered on the pages of history, and of whom we may write and speak as

<sup>1</sup> Jo., xv., 5.

<sup>2</sup> Matt., xvi., 16.

his acts were even now before the tribunal of posterity. To gain such a privilege, a man must unite, with integrity of character and ascendancy of genius, public services sufficiently great to disarm hostility. We can declare with legitimate pride, that even before it is ended, the pontificate of Leo XIII. has found its definite place in the annals of contemporary ecclesiastics.<sup>1</sup>

The visitor to the castle of Ferney (Switzerland), which was once the home of Voltaire, is shown the picture of the impious philosopher, and beneath this is seen an oval cup in solid silver, upon which are inscribed the words: "Son coeur est ici, son esprit est partout!" "His heart is here, his spirit everywhere!" We may ask what now remains of Voltaire's heart and spirit? Obsolete sophisms and self-extinguishing blasphemies. He holds thus the destiny of the impious, verifying the words of the Holy Ghost: "Vidi impium superexaltatum et elevatum sicut celsus Libani, et transivi et ecce non erat, et quæsi eum, et non inventus locus eius!"<sup>2</sup>

The Vatican presents a quite different spectacle: A captive, a weak and aged man, yet courageous and filled with apostolic zeal. The most powerful of rulers, the head of that Church, the funeral which the boasting Voltaire expected to attend.

Of *him* we can say in all truth: "Leo is in Rome, his spirit everywhere!" Never have the words of the Pope found a greater echo. They penetrate the palace of the sovereign, and stir the hearts of the people. And while the powers of the world tremble and quake and crumble, the Vatican presents a unique example of that moral force which is the only basis of every civilized society. This fact is so conspicuous that the unbeliever, Charles Moissais, remarked, a few months ago, in the "Revue des Deux Mondes:" "Nowhere has the Church subjects (!), yet in all climes she has found her faithful, who are more submissive to the supreme teacher of faith and of morals than any subjects are to any prince."<sup>3</sup> The highest authorities within the various camps unite in saying that the world has arrived at a solemn and critical period in its history. And at this moment, while the crisis approaches, the prisoner of the Vatican enjoys a wonderful increase of the influence and authority of his universal magistracy. The Papacy once more appears in the moral order as the sun of civilization. Every condition of man, all that thinks, all that intelligently

See *Le Pape Léon XIII., Sa Vie, Son Action Religieuse, Politique et Sociale*, Mgr. de T'Serclaes; 2 vols., 1894.

Ps., xxxvi., 35, sq.

"N'ayant nulle part des sujets, l'Eglise a en tout lieu des fidèles, plus soumis au même docteur de la foi et de la moralité que n'importe quels sujets à n'importe quel prince."

acts, is illumined by its rays. Charles Benoist, in commenting on the letter of Leo XIII. regarding the reunion of dissenting sects with the Church, says, in the review quoted above: "It is not the head of one church alone who has written this letter; it is the common father of that universal church which virtually embraces the whole of humanity within its fold." And he adds this significant declaration: "The affairs of Rome have more and more become the affairs of the world, and those of the world have, in like manner, become the affairs of Rome."<sup>1</sup>

From the lofty summits of his high position, the paternal regard of the Pope takes in the whole kingdom of Christ. The Vatican has the aspect of Sinai. Not, indeed, midst thunders and lightning, but in the august isolation of his captivity, Leo XIII. promulgates anew the Magna Charta of regenerated humanity, securing harmony between divine and human rights and powers. His voice, replete with authority, resembles the rumbling of mighty waters, dominates the tumult of modern activity, and the world starts with astonishment and emotion. In the feverish business life, and the alluring enticements of pleasure, it stops to hear the word of the Vicar of Jesus Christ: "Et stupebant super doctrina eius, erat enim docens eos quasi potestatem habens, et non sicut Scribae" . . . . "Quia in potestate est sermo eius."<sup>2</sup> Even the representatives of irreligion exclaim: "Nunquam sic locutus est homo, sicut hic homo!"<sup>3</sup>

And to-day the grandest intellects, the noblest hearts in all parts of the world, join Benoist in the expression of his love and admiration: "Leo XIII. reigns and governs—reigns so gloriously and governs so happily that we cannot but repeat the salutation which greets the ears of the newly elected Pope: "Ad multos annos!"<sup>4</sup>

### III.—LEO XIII. AND AMERICA.

In this concert of laudations, congratulations and prayers, America cannot be satisfied to occupy a subordinate position. On the contrary, she must be in the first ranks, and all the more since she has listened to the paternal voice of the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his Encyclical, the worthy crown of so many proofs of affec-

<sup>1</sup> "Ce n'est pas le maître exclusif d'une église qui a écrit cette lettre; c'est le Père commun de cette église universelle, dans laquelle virtuellement l'humanité entière est englobée." "Les affaires de Rome sont de plus en plus devenues les affaires du monde, et les affaires du monde de plus en plus les affaires de Rome."

<sup>2</sup> Marc. I., 22; Luc. iv., 32.

<sup>3</sup> Jo. vii., 46

<sup>4</sup> "Léon XIII. règne et gouverne, il règne si glorieusement, et gouverne si heureusement, qu'on ne peut que répéter le cri par lequel les Papes sont salués à leur exaltation: Que ce soit encore pour de longues années! *Ad multos annos!*"—*Ibid.*

onate solicitude with which the Holy Father has already been prodigal to us. We may say even more: American Catholics are not the only persons who listen with respect to the words of Leo, and they are not alone in offering their homage. The eagerness with which the leading papers of our country have published the whole encyclical, the kindly and admiring comments with which they generally accompanied it, the testimony which so many distinguished men have rendered publicly to the character and action of the Sovereign Pontiff, furnish a striking proof of this, were any other needed than the sense of justice which animates the American people. Mgr. Satolli had reason to say, on the occasion of the anniversary of Leo XIII.: "Nor will America, throughout its length and breadth, withhold its tribute of loyal and generous veneration, esteem and gratitude to the Pope for those acts of his pontificate which have at various times been promulgated, and by which he has shown his confidence and hope in the grand future of this mighty nation. During the seventeen years of his rule, nothing has been more remarkable than the incessant growth of his benignant moral influence." Without distinction of belief or political parties, the American people fully appreciate the eminent qualities of heart and mind which distinguish Leo XIII., and they salute willingly the seat of Peter in the words of Saint Bernard: *Summae aequitatis sedes*." They understand the benefits of Christian civilization; they are profoundly convinced that if the brotherhood of men is the basis of such civilization, God Himself is the apex, and that the manger of Bethlehem is its cradle. For this reason, the most eminent men of America look with respectful admiration upon this star, "*lumen in caelo*," which shines in the firmament of Rome to show us the way, and to invite peoples and kings, the great and the small, to bow before and adore their common Master, as once before the shepherds and princes coming from the east were led by a star. Specially do Americans worship that virtue so rare in our days—the virtue of gratitude. They honor their heroes, they honor their friends, they count Leo XIII. among their friends, and gladly address him these words of the poet:

"Tua me virtus tibi fecit amicum."

Thus the voice of Leo XIII. finds an echo in the heart of our people when he speaks as the head of that religion of which Columbus will always be one of the most beautiful ornaments. Our people never forget that "when America was but yet a new-born babe, uttering in its cradle its first feeble cries, the Church took to her bosom and motherly embrace." They remember with the Pope the names of many illustrious missionaries written in their

history with letters of gold, perpetuated in the names of "so many of our towns and rivers and mountains and lakes, teaching and clearly witnessing how deeply our beginnings were marked with the footprints of the Catholic Church." They join the Catholics in celebrating with the Pope "the well-known friendships and the familiar intercourse," which existed between "the great Washington and the first bishop set by apostolic authority over the Church of America." They acknowledge Leo's "ardour of soul," his "mildness and charity," when he invites "those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith" to unite in the Church, "the common mother of all"; his fatherly love, when he "implores and demands succour from men of apostolic zeal for the long and continued unhappy lot of the Indians and negroes."

And as to the personal sentiments of Leo XIII. to America, his name will ever be inseparable from what he calls "that most auspicious event," "*auspicatissimum factum*," the World's Fair of Chicago. We do not exaggerate in saying that not a sovereign of the world took a more active and cordial part in that memorable undertaking than the venerable captive-king of the Vatican. Leo XIII. has "shared our rejoicings and good wishes"; he entrusted the precious treasures of the Vatican libraries to the waves of the ocean for us; the oratory of the Vatican has witnessed the prayers offered by the Supreme Pontiff "for our welfare and our greatness," and "wishing to be in some manner present with us in our festivities, he cheerfully sent one who should represent his person." And we do not need to say that his noble heart, as well as his distinguished mind, presided over the choice of the representative. But let us hasten to add that this special participation of the Holy Father in our national success was but just and most natural. It was just, and could not have failed to be, by reason of the majesty and moral force of the power with which he is invested, for no monarch of the earth represents an empire so remarkable in extent and influence as the spiritual pastor of a kingdom which extends "from sea to sea, and from the river unto the end of the earth."<sup>1</sup> Again, it was but natural, owing to the shining personality of Leo XIII., in whom, underlying the Pontiff, is the eminent literateur and the refined connoisseur and lover of the creations of human art. It was natural, moreover, from the eager interest which he never fails to give to all that honors and raises humanity; and last, but not least, from "the high esteem and the great love" which he proclaims before the whole world for "a nation in which he plainly discerns latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and Christianity."

---

<sup>1</sup> Ps. 71, 8.



The innermost reason for this predilection for America has been expressed by Leo XIII. in four words of his Encyclical, words which we think defy translation into any modern language. If the imagination could conceive of our country as a vast dwelling, and, written upon that dwelling, an inscription giving the distinctive character of its inhabitants, where is the philologist who could render in more expressive and significant a phrase, the meaning of these words:

*Americanum  
validum inventa genus!*

It is after the manner of the sculptor, in the style of the lapidary, it is, as it were, cut in the marble by a master hand; it is incisive, it is striking, it is energetic, each word tells; the design is complete in its essential outline: it is a strong and robust nation, full of initiative and activity, shrinking from no labor, from no enterprise, gifted with noble and generous feelings, "progressing and developing by giant strides," having made "in the course of one century a marvellous increase in wealth and power." It possesses these qualities in all the vigor of youth. It possesses the advantages which that "*flos virentis aevi*" gives, the "*invenilis calor et vigor*," of which the poet speaks, but it is also surrounded with dangers of this "*aetas apta capi*" and "*pravi docilis*." Speaking afterwards of the establishment of the republic, the Holy Father characterizes the conquest of the war for independence by the two classic words of Tacitus: "*libertatem et principatum*." He rejoices in it, and recalls with satisfaction that the result was obtained "with Catholic aid." The author of the life of Garibaldi congratulated Nerva and Trajan for having finally united, thanks to their personal qualities, the two things "which formerly seemed incompatible: *res olim dissociabiles; principatum et libertatem*." Now, by what means can there be preserved to a nation so vigorous and prosperous these two things upon which Leo XIII. so warmly congratulates America? What preventives can be employed against the dangers of youth? Washington was more of a statesman than Nerva and Trajan; he was a more experienced observer in this matter than Tacitus. He was not only an excellent general and skillful administrator; he was, first of all, a religious man, a Christian. In order to unite "liberty and independent government," he proclaimed loudly the necessity of morality, that the State should have a solid basis, to avoid the excess of individual liberty as well as abuse of power, and to secure the true happiness of the people. Leo XIII. does not hesitate to associate himself with the declaration made by "the serious citizen, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius

tot  
ene  
ans



and statesmanship." He gives this thought its necessary completion by saying: no morality without religion! And why? Because "religion by its very nature guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded." It alone attaches governments and peoples to the only Legislator for all men; it alone suggests motives of action which are independent of human caprice; it alone establishes an effectual sanction for the exercise of liberty. If this is so, does a Pope need to recall at length to the American people that the Catholic Church teaches, preserves, and develops this religious sentiment? That, consequently, it has an inherent right to full and entire liberty in all civil society, and that it is in the interest of society to accord it such liberty? The Holy Father contents himself with few words to indicate this very evident conclusion, which could only be contested by the hatred of a blind Puritanism.

May the "latent forces" which the perspicacious eye of Leo XIII. sees in our people, develop evermore "for the advancement alike of civilization and Christianity." May the foundation of this grandiose social edifice, laid by such men as Washington, become firmer day by day "by the most powerful influence of religion." The time of youth passes for nations as well as for individuals, but nations may preserve their strength and vigor by avoiding that consumption of peoples which is called indifference in the matter of religion; which is a necessary consequence, in the moral order as in the physical order, of a life given exclusively to earthly pleasures and satisfactions. The national spirit must before all be a Christian spirit. If "God giveth joy to the youth"<sup>1</sup> of a people, he can also "renew it like the eagle's."<sup>2</sup> Let us hope that at the close of another century a Leo will again send his greeting to the mighty eagle of America, and that he will address it to the Catholic Church strengthened and enlarged; to a whole nation as earnest in its attachment for religion as in its love of independence and liberty; to a matured America, whose character and glory may be expressed in these words:

Americanum  
validum religione genus  
amico foedere socians  
Libertatem et Principatum!

#### IV.—LEO XIII. AND CATHOLIC AMERICA.

Let us now behold the Father in the midst of his Catholic family, among those of his children who join to the sentiments of respect and admiration those of filial piety and complete submission. We will not stop to consider the eulogies and expressions

<sup>1</sup> Ps. 42, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. 102, 5.

of good will made to both high and low, to both pastor and people, but rather hasten to hear the commands, the teachings, and admonitions of the supreme ruler and teacher.

*Apostolic Delegation.*

*Unity* is an essential quality of the Church; it is at the same time the strength of the hierarchy, the clergy, and the people; it must be the characteristic mark of every Catholic institution; it will insure the success of every work of faith or of charity. Hence the Holy Father insists on unity in several parts of the encyclical. A primary condition of united activity is an intimate connection with the head of the Church, the See of Peter. Leo XIII. mentions with pleasure that Catholic America has always been distinguished for this; but he wishes "to draw more closely the bonds of duty and attachment which connect so many thousands of Catholics to the apostolic see." In order to execute his noble design, and at the same time to certify "that in his judgment and affection America occupies the same place and rights as other states," Leo XIII. has established the apostolic delegation, "the true meaning and the ultimate aim" of which is "to strengthen the constitution of the Church and to fortify her discipline." The Holy Father relates a well-known fact in stating that "the mass of the Catholics understand how salutary this action was destined to be." We shall be allowed to quote here the very words in which this sentiment was expressed at a solemn gathering of American Catholics:

"The apostolic delegation is the creation of an especial solicitude of the Holy Father for our country. The great Leo XIII. has sent us his delegate by right of the supreme jurisdiction which he holds over the whole Church, and by the inspiration of his all-embracing and paternal love, in which we have our own peculiar share. Hence we heartily salute the delegate in the words of St. Ignatius:<sup>1</sup> 'Whom the father sendeth we receive, even as the father himself.'"

This is the expression of an enlightened faith, of Catholic conviction; hence it is shared by all the Catholics of our land.

No one outside the Church who judges impartially will misunderstand our position. We Catholics, as American citizens, desire home rule, and publicly proclaim that none but our own people, and those elected to represent them, shall direct our political and civil affairs. We likewise demand home rule for the Church, by right of our Catholic and American freedom. In our conviction, God has placed the Pope at the head of the Church, and he

<sup>1</sup> "Quemcunque enim Paterfamilias mittit ad gubernandam familiam suam, hunc accipere debemus sicut ipsum qui mittit."—*S. Ign. M. ad Eph.*

alone has the right to govern the whole Church. Those sent by him, whether delegate or bishop, of whatever nation they may be, coming in his name and bearing his authority, are therefore at home in every quarter of the globe, as the father is everywhere at home among his children. Let us then as Catholics give renewed expression of this conviction, by laying at the feet of Monsig. Satolli, the illustrious representative of the Holy See, the vow of our respect and obedience. A resolution unanimously adopted by the same congress reads: "We hail with joy the establishment of the apostolic delegation in these United States, since it is a proof of the paternal love and solicitude of the Holy Father for our country, and particularly for the Catholics of America."<sup>1</sup>

### *Faith and Reason.*

Speaking in the capacity of supreme teacher of the Church, the Holy Father indicates precisely the stand which we Catholics of America must take in regard to the triple error mentioned above.

Leo XIII. "commends to the affection and generosity" of the American Catholics the American college at Rome and gives a most emphatic answer to *rationalism* by directing special attention to the Catholic University of America. This University is the creation of Leo XIII. Its whole purpose, its only ambition, is to protect and enlighten our faith by the advancement of science and learning in every direction. Even more, the encyclical inscribes the proud words on our banner: "*Anteire, non subsequi!*" "Be leaders, not followers, in the existing keen competition of knowledge; cultivate refinement of learning; investigate so far as it is possible the entire domain of nature." Do we accept? Most willingly and joyfully. By obedience? Yes; by a rational obedience, by an obedience enlightened by the strongest conviction, which the very motto of the university inspires: *Deus lux mea!* Our God is the God of sciences, "Deus scientiarum Dominus." This infallible word is our "stella rectrix," our guiding star; it makes our faith reasonable, unshakable; it encourages and directs the investigation of the scientist, and places a restraint on only one liberty, the sad liberty of error.

Next fall will witness the opening of the philosophical department of the university. McMahon Hall will perpetuate the name of its noble and pious donor, whose generosity has also been commended by the Holy Father in the pages of the encyclical. Besides the name of Mgr. McMahon, the words, "Science, Philosophy, Letters," appear conspicuously engraved in the stone of the beautiful structure. The roof will be crowned by a statue of

<sup>1</sup> See Report of the Congress of the Delegates of the German-American Centralverein, assembled in New York, September, 1894.



Christ, the Light of the World." Thus we proclaim openly our conviction that in "following Him we shall not walk in the darkness of error."<sup>1</sup>

From the apostle of this same Christ we learn what became of the wisdom of those who "liked not to have God in their knowledge"; "they became vain in their thoughts" and "changed the truth of God into a lie."<sup>2</sup> We witness the same fact in our day. The false science of paganism, the science without God, has been resuscitated. In the name of "emancipated science" and "independent morals" gigantic efforts have been made to lay bare the secrets of God's creation without and even against revelation; to secure to mankind the maximum of happiness and morality."<sup>3</sup> And now the most authorized representatives of this new "science" and "morality" feel themselves obliged to confess: "In vanum laboravimus!" Do we, therefore, deny the real progress of modern science? In no way; we proclaim it highly; we are proud of it and associate faith with it, because it also belongs to us; for, as Thiers says: "Catholicity has never impeded one thought, unless it be of such who were not made to think."<sup>4</sup> Reason itself advises us to avoid the example of those who "are led astray by incomprehensible errors because they refuse to believe in comprehensible mysteries."<sup>5</sup> Following the advice of the Holy Father, we will do our utmost to emulate the grand example of the alma mater of Louvain, which, in our day, as it has done in the past, gives to both church and science many illustrious champions, and which, in great measure, procured for Belgium the honorable position she so nobly occupies among Christian nations.

#### *Church and State.*

The relationship between *Church and State* is treated in our encyclical in a very significant way. The passage referring to it is even, in our judgment, the most striking feature of the papal document. Leo XIII. surely does not propose any new doctrine or decision; but he shows in an unmistakable way his intention to place us on our guard against what is called by the Vatican Council the "attenuation" of Catholic doctrine, the inevitable consequence of which is a dangerous condescension towards error, a weakening of the true spirit of faith and of truly Catholic

<sup>1</sup> "Qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris."—John viii., 12.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. i.

<sup>3</sup> "Assurer aux hommes le maximum de bonheur et de moralité." So Renan, Condorcet, and lately Berthelot.

<sup>4</sup> "Le catholicisme n'a jamais empêché de penser que ceux qui n'étaient pas faits pour penser."

<sup>5</sup> "Pour ne pas vouloir croire d'incompréhensibles mystères, les incrédules suivent d'incompréhensibles erreurs."

courage in its profession. "It often unfortunately happens that by the gradual diminution of the revealed doctrine Catholic sentiment is attenuated in the children of the Church."<sup>1</sup> The Holy Father accurately distinguishes between the *hypothesis* and the *thesis*, between the *fact* and the *principle*, between a peculiar situation existing in our country and a normal state of things, between the condition of salutary Catholic activity and its true cause.

As to the *fact*, Leo XIII. fully recognizes that the separation of Church and State, as established by our constitution, and practically observed in our country, is not only a social *necessity* but also a social *benefit*. "Thanks to the equity of the laws in America, the Church is free to live and to act without hindrance, unopposed by the constitution and the government, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals." This is the result of religious liberty, which our republic acknowledges in all its logical consequences. She does not only permit the liberty of conscience in the individual, but guarantees also the social existence of the church, her right of self-government and self-propagation. This separation of Church and State has nothing in common with a certain régime, which, on the other side of the Atlantic, screens and dissimulates very often under the same banner the oppression of the church by the state. But the separation of Church and State, even if loyally practiced, as it is in our country, is not the *normal condition*, nor is it applicable in all places. In the first place, the historical development and the religious situation of a country might have brought about a quite different state of things, equally legitimate, equally advantageous, and *even better*.

Moreover, the Catholic ideal—not only theoretical, but quite practical, and the one which has often been realized—is the *harmonious alliance* between Church and State, a union which does not destroy in any way the distinction between the two powers, nor their mutual independence in their own sphere of action. The Church and State are two distinct forms of human society; two circles, placed one above the other, without, however, being blended. Society, as such, has been elevated to the supernatural order, as well as man himself. Christ is the king of nations, as well as of the individual—*rex populum, rex regum et dominus dominantium*. His Church, by the heritage of His divine authority over souls, possesses the same royal dignity in regard to Christian society and Christian government which she enjoys in the homage paid by each of her faithful. This immutable truth of faith does

<sup>1</sup> "Infelicitèr contigit, ut plures etiam e catholice Ecclesie filiis a via veræ pietatis aberrarent, in iisque, *diminutis paullatim veritatibus, sensus catholicus attenuaretur.*" —*Const. de Fide*, cap. iv.

not destroy the complete independence nor the perfect autonomy of the civil power exercised in its proper sphere, but it denies that the civil power is absolutely and in all matters independent of the Church. To admit this independence of the State as a *principle* would be to fall into the error of liberalism, which is, in fact, a *social rationalism*, or a denial of the social kingdom of Christ. Consequently, it is an error that must be uprooted, "error tollendus," to maintain "that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable state of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient, *universe licere vel expedire*, for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced."

Finally, to attribute the wonderful growth of the Church in the United States only, or principally, to the régime under which Catholics live in this country, would be to confound the intrinsic *cause* of activity within the Church with the *exterior condition* of her free development. The Church exists by force of her own vitality, the result of her indestructible spirit, her divine life: in other words, it is the Holy Ghost who penetrates her whole being, her activity as well as her life. No doubt a carefully guarded liberty of worship facilitates her action by removing the obstacles which hostile legislation might oppose to her progress; but "she would bring forth more abundant fruits, if, in addition to liberty she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority." "*Quod enim incolumis apud vos res est catholica, quod prosperis etiam auctibus crescit, id omnino fecunditati tribuentum, qua divinitus pollet Ecclesia, quaeque si nullus adversetur, nulla res impedimento sit, se sponte effert atque effundit; longe uberioribus editura fructus si, praeter libertatem, gratia legum quatur patocinioque publicae potestatis.*"

But is not this doctrine offensive to the ears of those who are prejudiced against us? or even to the spirit of patriotism? To answer the former seeming objection, it will be sufficient to remember that we undertake the task of Tantalus when we attempt to remove all prejudices against the truth, or to dispose of every evil pretext of our enemies, for bad faith never lays down its arms. In regard to patriotism, Melchior de Vogué, member of the French Academy, has very well said: "We speak of patriotism to-day more than ever before, and while we deafen our ears with its din the virtue is itself mutilated."<sup>1</sup> An excellent French daily (*La Croix*) lately made this statement: "The French people would become the greatest nation on earth if they would only cease to believe themselves already so; or if they would only take the trouble to look about occasionally to see what other nations are doing." This is not true beyond the seas alone. Since when has

<sup>1</sup> "L'on n'a jamais tant qu'aujourd'hui parlé de la patrie, et, pendant que l'on s'étourdit du mot, la chose s'altère."



patriotism become identical with Chauvinism? Since when does loyalty to one's country rob the citizen of the liberty of thought, oblige him to disavow the knowledge of any perfection, either ideal or existing, he may find elsewhere, so as to be able to vaunt his own as the ideal government? But we would say even more. The very love of country urges us to profess and practice our faith in its integrity, for the Catholic religion is the chief safeguard of patriotism, since it makes it our duty to be "upright and virtuous citizens;" to observe in "political life conscientiousness, self-restraint, and integrity." Again, by practicing our faith, we manifest our attachment to the constitution. This guarantees religious liberty, which is the most precious of all. Now, do we make use of this liberty of conscience if we allow ourselves to be frightened into a semi-profession of our faith, either by curtailing, or by hiding it under a bushel? Shall we, under a vain pretext of toleration or pacification, allow the non-Christian, of whatever school, to occupy the floor alone? Surely, if we have one spark of Christian pride remaining, if we estimate the true value of the precious treasure of our faith, we shall never suffer such humiliation and ostracism. "Christianity," said a pious religious, a martyr of the commune, Father Olivaint, S.J., "rests upon the testimony, that is to say, on the courage, of those who profess it. Under a government of universal tolerance, a Catholic may and must courageously defend the liberty of truth, and since all claim the right of expressing their opinions, why should not we also have the courage of our convictions? Ours are not mere changeable and uncertain opinions, but immutable principles which never vary. We have the truth, and consequently have not an apparent but a real right to bring it before the searchlight." As Catholics, then, and as Americans, we profess our faith without diminution or dissemblance. If we shrink from the task, our non-Catholic fellow citizens will be the first to shrug their shoulders, as, on the contrary, they will be the first to admire our Christian courage, and our true American spirit of independence.

#### *Social Question.*

The present state of evolution which *socialism* is undergoing, adds a new importance to the passages of the encyclical which refer to economic and social problems of our country. We here find the line of thought which inspired and dictated the encyclical "*Rerum novarum*," expressed in a manner both concrete and precise. It will suffice to read the doctrines and advice here given in order to be convinced that in the eyes of Leo XIII. it is impossible to conciliate two such opposite principles as Christianity and socialism, and that "Christian socialism" must be considered as a veritable monstrosity. The law which presides over the rela-

between capital and labor is not a law of antagonism, but one of reciprocity and harmony; it is the divine law of justice and equity. All theories and practices which deviate from this line of action will only serve to perpetuate, embitter and develop the present social entanglement. The obvious solution of the social problem lies in the *Christian concordat* between capital and labor proposed by Leo XIII. Even in the purely political and economic point of view, this is the only one which is practicable, satisfying and lasting, otherwise society will sway helplessly between inconsiderate (blind) reaction and violent revolution, between despotism, which preserves nothing, and socialism, which destroys all.

Socialism must, and in fact does, bear ill will against *religion*, which presents to man his final and eternal destiny beyond the tomb, and teaches him to accept the inequalities and trials of this life. Bebel and Liebknecht (Germany), Jaurès and Guesde (France), Anseele and Vandervelde (Belgium), have carried the social atheism of liberalism to its logical conclusion by proclaiming the maxim: *Ni Dieu, ni maître!* No God, no master! The solution of the social question supposes, therefore, above all, the restoration of society in Christ, the observance of the "precepts and laws of the gospel."

Socialism attempts to destroy the bonds of *family* union, because the acquisition, augmentation, and perpetuation of property is the natural coronation of domestic society. Hence it is necessary to inculcate "the Christian dogma of the *unity and indissolubility of marriage*," to oppose by all means "the licentiousness of *divorce*," which is "the most deadly pest to the community"; it "ruins families and undermines the strength of kingdoms."

Socialism favors everywhere the "*neutral schools*," the "schools without any religious creed." The leaders openly call them the "nurseries of socialism"; "*des pépinières du socialisme*," (Anseele), "seminaries of socialists" "*des fabriques de socialistes*," (Vandervelde). Logic, as well as events proves them to be in the wrong. Because "neutral schools," even when they do not positively combat religion, "hide, repell, and exile it; they destroy religious sentiment and prepare the youth for social iniquity," as Jules Simon has well said. The school question is, therefore, an essentially *social* question, and M. de Burlet, Minister of Public Instruction in Belgium, was right in saying, a few weeks ago, "I am profoundly convinced, that there is no social undertaking more important, more essential, than the restoration of religious sentiment by means of the school; . . . this religious sentiment has become weakened in a great measure among the children of the social (neutral) schools." Here we have the reason why the Holy



Father in the encyclical thrice returns to the subject of Christian education of youth, warmly recommending the "Catholic parochial schools," the "Sunday schools for imparting Christian doctrine, and summer schools." Here again is the reason why he insists on the duty "to carry into effect, sedulously and faithfully the decrees of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore," mentioning especially the decrees "for defending and developing the Catholic education of youth."

Socialism deceives and misleads the workingman more easily, because, in connection with its subversive doctrines, it proposes some *useful reforms*, and objects to certain *real abuses*. In order to gain ascendancy, it develops the *labor associations*, notably those whose members are bound to a blind obedience toward their leaders, particularly in case of strikes.

The Catholic clergy and people should therefore make it their duty to look after the condition of the laborer, and take an active interest in every movement to advance his welfare. The laborers have the *perfect right* "to seek aid for the improvement of their condition"; "it is proper and desirable to assert and secure the rights of the many." "But this is not to be done at any time or in any manner by violation of justice and duty."

To preserve the workingman from the tyranny of the socialists, it is necessary zealously to favor the formation of *Christian labor associations*: "The working classes have assuredly the right to unite in associations for the promotion of their interests. But these unions must never be of a kind in which the material improvement of the laborers may imperil far weightier, viz., the religious and moral, interests."

Without being properly religious associations they should always be *based upon religion*; they must "never be ruled by and servilely obey persons who are not steadfast for the right and friendly to religion"; otherwise "they will be extremely prejudicial to the interests as well of individuals as of the community. Beneficial they cannot be."

The Holy Father strongly asserts the *liberty* of the workingman: "Nobody is allowed to hinder any one to dispose of his services when he pleases and where he pleases." This rule of conduct has a deep significance. In Europe, where the question of syndicates is debated among Catholics, the conclusion has been drawn from our encyclical—and, it seems to us, not without good reason—that the Holy Father rejects the so-called obligatory syndicates ("*syndicats obligatoires*"). This same rule guards the laborer against the arbitrary and tyrannical imposition of strikes often initiated by socialistic leaders. In alluding to the strikes of last year the Pope points out their danger, and the evils of which they are often and even ordinarily the cause.

Among the things which "filled with hope and joy" the heart of Leo XIII., he enumerates also "the associations for mutual relief for the indigent, for the promotion of temperance, etc." He likewise desires the Catholics in general, as he does the working men in particular, to join no society other than those which are frankly Catholic, in order to secure "the safeguards of the faith," "unless forced by necessity to do otherwise." By a stronger motive are they obliged "to shun not only those associations which have been openly condemned by the judgment of the Church, but those also which, in the opinion of intelligent laymen, and especially of the bishops, are regarded as suspicious and dangerous."

The *priest* naturally occupies a specified place in the work of social restoration. He knows that the poor are the aristocracy of the Church; he is the social man by excellence, because he has always been, and still is, the man of all. According to the Holy Father, the priest must take the initiative, and become the propagator, and even the director, of associations of labor, wherever circumstances will permit. "As presidents of societies thus organized among Catholics, it would be well to appoint either *priests* or upright laymen of weight and character."

This new field of sacerdotal activity is plainly indicated in the words which the Holy Father last year addressed to a bishop whose ardent zeal for the advancement of the working classes has earned for him the glorious name of "l'évêque des ouvriers," "the bishop of the workingmen," Mgr. Doutreloux, of Liège (Belgium):

"Shall we allow the laborer to pass over to Socialism and to revolt? It is the priest, first of all, who must be exhorted to go to the people! He can no longer remain shut up in his church and presbytery. He must be animated with the apostolic spirit of a St. Francis Xavier, who went about here and there, everywhere, scattering the blessings of religion."<sup>1</sup>

#### *Catholic Press.*

Among the liberties which, in the words of the Holy Father, must not become "pernicious," we must not fail to cite that of the press. Leo XIII. has in various documents insisted on the apostolic duty of the press either for good or evil; he has, on many occasions, been pleased to show an especial regard for its representatives, including non-Catholics, only refusing to deal with the temptations of abject materialism, or the bad faith of a Zola. The encyclical devotes a magnificent page to this subject, remarkable for the broadness and depth of views therein expressed; and it

<sup>1</sup> See the very remarkable pastoral letter of the same bishop on the social question, "Lettre Pastorale sur la Question Ouvrière," Liège, 1894, p. 31.

shows how well the pontiff discerns the pulsations of our epoch, and particularly of America. Here, too, Leo XIII., by his art of well-saying, has given expression, in two words, to a motto, the conscientious application of which can alone guarantee to the press a civilizing influence: "*Religione duce, probitate comite!*" This, says the Holy Father, must be above all the sacred and unalterable rule of conduct for the Catholic press, since the part it has to play has a greater importance in a country where the people are obliged to live in an environment of would-be neutrality, and to breathe an atmosphere impregnated with indifferentism. This masterly page contains words of great consolation and encouragement for those who have undertaken a work so meritorious, and yet so often thankless and unpromising. The Holy Father reminds us, at the same time, that the honor of defending the Church, and of seconding her efforts for good, does not imply the right of advising and much less of governing her. The journalist belongs not to the teaching, but to the hearing body of the Church. The episcopal authority is of divine origin, and must always be respected. Obedience to this authority will ever be one of the first duties of all who wish to properly serve religion. Besides, this sincere submission is the test and bond of that perfect unity of doctrine and of action without which the influence of the press, instead of being beneficial to the progress of catholicity, or the salvation of souls, tends rather to become dangerous and destructive. "*Ut plane non tam repellere, quam inferre bellum, si qui vires discordia dissipant videantur.*"

This rule of conduct is based on the very constitution of the Church. The occasions of putting it in practice will certainly not be wanting. Let us call it to mind especially when duty demands a sacrifice. It is the best means the editor has of securing for his labor and propaganda an increased efficiency, which will revert to the good of religion and society.

"Simon, lovest thou Me more than these?" Thus spoke the Saviour to the first Pope; thus He spoke to his successors, and thus He speaks to Leo. And in the name of Leo, answer the Orient and the Occident, the faithful of the universe: Yes, Holy Father, thou hast proven thy love for Christ. The whole world witnesseth thy indefatigable zeal for the glory of God and the welfare of humanity. Thou art truly the Father of thy children. We Catholics of America have special reasons to praise thy fatherly love. The late encyclical is a new proof of thy affection. We express our thanks, our filial devotion and obedience. We believe what thou believest; we condemn what thou condemnest. We heed thy doctrine and counsels. *Nemo tam Pater!*

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

JOS. SCHROEDER, D.D.

# ITALY'S RECONCILIATION WITH THE HOLY SEE.

*Leape Léon XIII., sa vie, son action religieuse, politique et sociale.*  
Par Mgr. de T'SERCLAES, avec une introduction par Mgr. Baunard.  
Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. Two volumes. Illustrated.

SEVENTEEN years ago when the telegraph girdled the world with tidings of the death of Pius IX., and of the hostile advance of British and Russian forces on Constantinople, there was gloom in the hearts of many, dismay in all. The war-clouds soon on the horizon seemed settling over the Turkish capital, and Europe trembled on the brink of a great war. The critical state of affairs on the Bosphorus was most providential, for it left diplomacy no time to meddle in the great events taking place on the banks of the Tiber. Without let or hindrance from Italian or other governments the Conclave was held, and the gloom cast over the Catholic world by the death of Pius IX. was dispelled, and on February 20, 1878, the aged Cardinal Caterini proclaimed from the balcony of the façade of St. Peter's to an anxious crowd: *Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum. Habemus Papam Eminentissimum et Reverendissimum Dominum Joachim Pecci qui sibi nomen sumpsit Leonis XIII.* And so, as Mr. Charles Kent, in his epilogue after St. Malachy's prophecy has beautifully expressed it:

"Through the Cross on Cross of Pius,  
As through Mary's Dolours Seven,  
Lo! from Death what Life emerges,  
Joy from anguish, Light from Heaven."

Now that *Lumen in caelo* has shone amid the darkness of the seventeen years, is admirably told in the remarkable volumes by Mgr. de T'Serclaes, rector of the Belgian College in Rome. He had exceptional advantages in writing them; he has had access to both the Pecci and Vatican archives; he is honored with the personal friendship of the Holy Father; he has seen much of the events he graphically describes; and he has watched events from a position that has enabled him to grasp their importance and understand their drift. The volumes have been written with the Pope's approval, and almost under his supervision, and reach us with the warm approbation of the Cardinal Secretary of State, and a eulogistic preface from the skilled pen of the Rector of the Catholic University of Lille. Nobody can rise up from the perusal of this work without

having improved his knowledge of the world's affairs, and without an increased admiration for Leo XIII. It passes in review all the acts of the first sixteen years of the present Pontificate. The Pope's encyclical and other letters, on Socialism, philosophy, religious affairs in France, Christian marriage, the propagation of the faith, the relation of the secular and regular clergy in England, civil government, religious affairs in Italy, the Third Order of St. Francis, historical studies, the rosary, Freemasonry, the Christian constitution of States, liberty, the duties of Christian peoples, slavery, the working classes; these, and many more, are analyzed in a masterly manner. This long yet incomplete list of the subjects on which Leo XIII. has written, enables us to apply to him what was said of a great author: "What subject has he not touched, and touching adorned?"

These striking documents would alone suffice to glorify any pontificate; but Leo has added to his pontificate other glories. He has founded professorships and academies to promote philosophy and literature; he has opened the Vatican archives in the interest of history; he has honored art by such restorations as that of the Lateran apse; he has aided science by the erection of the Vatican observatory. The canonizations and beatifications, among them those of our own English martyrs, momentous events as they are, are not peculiar in their kind to Leo's reign. Not so the religious pacification of Germany and other countries. They form the crowning glory of his pontificate. The late Czar, Alexander III., was a great peacemaker in the material order; Leo XIII. is a greater peacemaker, for he has restored peace of a higher order—religious peace—to millions. And a true *pax Romana* would reign all over the world, would men but listen to the Pope's words. Unfortunately, it is in Rome, in his own city, and in Italy, his own country, that perverse men least listen to his words. Let us see what we can gather on this important subject from Mgr. de T'Serclaes's volumes.<sup>1</sup> In making this selection, we shall be fulfilling the desire Leo XIII. expressed in an audience given on February 2, 1879, to a thousand representative Catholic journalists, that Catholic writers should never cease from insisting on the necessity of the Pope's civil sovereignty.<sup>2</sup>

At the very outset of his pontificate, the watchword of the powers of darkness was to describe the new Pope as one who would reverse the *non possumus* policy of Pius IX. They feigned not to know that, in matters of principle, Leo XIII. would be as rocklike as any of his long line of predecessors. They could have

<sup>1</sup> The references throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, are to Mgr. de T'Serclaes's volumes.

<sup>2</sup> I., 254.

ected no weakness from Cardinal Pecci, if they had taken to  
rt his character as traced by one of the founders of the Italian  
gdom, Ratazzi, than whom, Thiers once said, there was no  
ewder observer in all Europe :

This Pecci is a man of undoubted worth ; strong of will, and  
ingular strictness in the exercise of his duties ; yet withal,  
essing the most pleasing manners possible. During his so-  
rn at Benevento, he showed at once his great abilities and his  
ided, unyielding character. Often have I spoken of him with  
g Leopold I., than whom no king had more discernment of  
racter, who had studied and appreciated Pecci as Nuncio in  
gium. We spoke of his great prudence, integrity, and stately  
nners, which made our officials live in dread of his person. His  
otion to the Holy See is unbounded ; he is a man of strong  
inciples ; his unbending, almost obstinate firmness, leaves no  
m to suspect him of frailty. One must own that he is a priest  
om one must respect and admire—a man of great political sa-  
ity, and of still greater learning.”

uch was the man who was to fling to the winds the principles  
which his predecessors had fought and suffered, in order to be  
nciled with a kingdom in which the seeds of death were in-  
ined, for it was a kingdom born in sin. He was to abandon, as  
e, what he had defended as Bishop of Perugia, and more re-  
tly as Camerlengo of a Conclave in which he had joined with  
whole Sacred College in protesting against the usurpations of  
t kingdom. The first public act of his pontificate showed how  
sistent his conduct would be. His first blessing as Pope was  
en to the people inside, not outside St. Peter's. Had the Holy  
her taken the latter course, the whole reptile press of Italy  
uld have shrieked out that Leo XIII. had cast overboard the  
icy of Pius IX.<sup>1</sup> But rumors of reconciliation persisted.  
ose who spread them were the last to credit them. They were  
n as tare among the wheat, to distract and divide the faithful.  
o XIII.'s Easter gift of 1878 to the world, his Encyclical *In-*  
*stabili Dei*, in which he foreshadowed all the great acts of his  
yn, dismayed and unmasked the rumor mongers. By it the  
y Pope asserted the rights and freedom of the Holy See. Leo  
II., renewed in it “all the declarations and protestations of every  
d which our predecessor of holy memory, Pius IX., has many  
es issued and repeated against the seizure of the civil dominions,  
d against the violation of the rights which belong to the Roman  
urch. All these We too by this Our Letter do altogether re-  
v and confirm.” And he expressed the hope that “We may be

<sup>1</sup> I. 197.

<sup>2</sup> I., 189.

restored to that old condition of things in which the counsels of Divine Wisdom had long ago placed the Popes of Rome."

Could anything be clearer or stronger? But that all might understand this better, the Pope almost immediately repeated his protests when appointing Cardinal Nina his Secretary of State, and when proclaiming the Jubilee of 1881. Nevertheless, rumors of reconciliation continued to crop up. They are, in truth, as straws at which the drowning grasp, and are most afloat when the tide of Italian miseries rises highest. Even Italy's "strong man," Signor Crispi, does not disdain them, but he has sought to attribute their being set afloat to the Pope. This assertion, made in the *Contemporary Review*, Mgr. de T'Serclaes shows to be utterly unfounded. Any reconciliation, as Leo XIII. has again and again pointed out, is impossible unless it restores to the Pope his sovereign independence. The form it must take has been sketched by a noble Piedmontese Senator of the Italian Kingdom, Count Castagnetto, when protesting against the infamous Zanardelli Code. "All religious questions apart," he said, "I maintain my opinion that it would be far more advantageous for Italy to reconcile itself with the Apostolic See, and to carry back its capital to the splendid city of Florence." Even those who fought for Italian unity now believe that a mistake was made when Rome was fixed on as the capital of the kingdom. One of Garibaldi's old companions in arms, General Türr, proposed to settle the Roman question by connecting the Vatican with the sea by means of a ship canal, giving the Pope free communication with the rest of the world. In 1887 another Garibaldian, Fazzari, resigned his seat in the Italian Chamber because that body was not in touch with the constituencies in their longing for a reconciliation with the Holy See. He added that he would not seek re-election until the Pope allowed Catholics to take part in parliamentary elections. Later on, in face of overwhelming taxes, financial scandals, famine, and miseries of all kinds, the Italian press least favorable to the rights of the Holy See, began to bewail Italy's unhappy state. The *Messaggero* lamented that things were not as they had been before the taking of Rome. The *Don Chisciotte* owned that everything had been sacrificed to gain Rome and despoil the Pope. The *Nuova Antologia* almost confessed that God was punishing Italy for its crimes! The *Folchetto* thought it was time to make a breach at Porta Pia in contrary direction to that of 1870. The influential Liberal paper, the *Corriere di Napoli* advised a return journey from the Pantheon, tomb of Victor Emanuel, to the Superga, the family vault of the House of Savoy. But official Italy remains obdurate. "As for territory," wrote ex-Minister Bonghi in the *Nuova Antologia*, "Italy cannot give back to the Pope a big, nor even a little slice."



most Italy has only offered its unacceptable Law of Guarantees and vaguely hinted at obtaining an international sanction for it. And on every occasion King Humbert has been made to proclaim the conquest of Rome as sacred [*intangibile*].<sup>1</sup>

It was expected by many, even by Catholics, that Leo XIII. would withdraw the Holy See's prohibition, so tersely expressed in the celebrated Abbé Margotti's phrase, *nè eletti, nè elettori*, against Italian Catholics taking part in the parliamentary elections in the Italian kingdom. In a brief to Duke Salviati, head of the Catholic societies of Italy, dated May 3, 1878, Leo XIII., however, confirmed the prohibition by approving the abstentionist policy of those societies. Count Masino's attempt to form a National Conservative party with Catholic help came to nothing because the prohibition was kept in force. In short, this prohibition, as a pamphlet issued by the *Civiltà Cattolica* shows, was ratified no less than sixty-two Papal documents between the years 1878 and 1889, for "reasons of a very high order," as Leo XIII. expressed it in speaking to the Federation of Catholic Societies of Rome on April 24, 1881. One such reason is suggested by words the Holy Father spoke to the Sacred College in 1879: "Always ready to stretch forth a helping hand to such as return repentant and with good will to the bosom of the Church and cease to attack her, We shall continue to combat those who war against her, and We shall persevere firmly and constantly in defending her rights, her independence and her liberty." To allow Italian Catholics to take part in parliamentary elections would be to stretch forth a friendly hand to those who have not ceased to attack the Church. Official Italy feels more keenly than anybody the truth in the Pope's words that "the public affairs of Italy can never prosper nor enjoy lasting peace until, as all justice requires, provision has been made for the dignity and freedom of the Sovereign Pontiff," and thinks, by securing Catholic help in elections, to shore up its tottering fabric.

Nothing is more striking in this life of Leo XIII. than the earnestness with which he desires that Italy should reconcile itself with the Holy See; how his patriotic heart longs that it "should be converted and live." How little, too, does the Holy Father ask—only that provision should be made for the dignity and freedom of the Holy See—that the Roman Pontiff should enjoy a sovereign independence. When will the really strong statesman arise that will free the princes of Savoy from the shackles the Masonic lodges have laid on them, and in the name of Italy shall say with the prodigal son: "I will arise and I will go to my

<sup>1</sup> I., 444; II., 192.



Father." Let those who have at heart the interests of Italy ponder over all that "the first of Italians," as his countrymen have called Leo XIII., has spoken or written about Italy and all Italy owes to the Popes. There is no grander page of historical writing than that of the Pope's Encyclical *Etsi Nos*, in which he sets forth all Italy owes to the Popes; how they defended her against barbarians and Turks; how art flourished under their patronage; how one in faith the Italians enjoyed a real and peaceful unity. The power to civilize and pacify, adds Leo XIII., the Church and the Pope have not lost, for they are the necessary results of Catholic teachings.<sup>1</sup>

We have enumerated above the chief glories of the first sixteen years of the pontificate of Leo XIII. Let us briefly enumerate the many infamies of the Italian government during those same years. Truly, as Mgr. de T'Serclaes remarks, "the history of modern Italy is indeed a sad history." Italy has put every difficulty and delay in the way of newly appointed bishops receiving the *exequatur*, and even went so far as to cite Mgr. Ruffo-Scilla before the courts for using the title of archbishop before he had received the *exequatur*. The state has claimed the right to dispose of sacred edifices; to pass judgment, as in the Martinucci case, on claims made against the Sovereign Pontiff; to force the Propaganda to convert its funds into Italian consols; to abolish tithes. It has attempted to secularize the schools of the Italian missions in the east, but the Marquis di Rudini had the good sense to stop this secularization. But its masterpiece has been the Zanardelli Penal Code, of which Leo XIII. said that "it directly attacked the rights of the Catholic clergy and indirectly the rights of the Apostolic See." But there is no necessity to insist on these things. The infamies of official Italy are well known to our readers.

It is sometimes asked even by some Catholics, why the Pope should not be satisfied with things as they are? They see him enjoying full freedom of communication with the faithful; they go to Rome and behold him amid the pomp and ceremony of a court; they find him dwelling in a palace amid the treasures of art and literature; they walk the streets of Rome during some jubilee-tide and are amazed because all men's minds seem bent on the Vatican and nobody seems to heed the luckless king in his stolen palace on the Quirinal.

Appearances are too often deceptive and so it is with the apparently happy position of the Pope in his own city. The tourist or pilgrim to the Vatican, struck by the pomp, the vastness, the wealth of the palace does not know that the Italian government regards the Pope as a mere tenant at will of the Vatican palace. The boasted Law of Guarantees only gives to the Pope "the free en-

<sup>1</sup> I., 216, 255, 359.

payment" of it. The official organs always speak of it as if it were national property. When in 1890, Leo XIII., crossing from one part of his palace to another, was supposed to have traversed a bit of Italian territory, a controversy arose on the subject in the Italian press. The official organ hastened on behalf of the Italian ministry to deny that there was any such thing as Pontifical territory in contradistinction to Italian territory and that at best the Pope only enjoyed that extra territoriality granted to the residence of certain foreign diplomatic officials. And so little does the Italian government recognize that the Pope has even the usufruct of his palace that Signor Crispi's paper, the "*Riforma*," threatened government interference when at the close of 1890, the prefect of the Apostolic Palaces ordered a small entry fee to be levied on visitors to the Vatican museums. Italian insolence went even to the absurd extreme of putting Leo XIII. on the electoral lists of 1890, and of convoking him as an elector under the number 3140, as "Pecci, Joachim, son of Lewis, deceased, residing in Rome." And gossip, which it is to be hoped for the sake of the royal personage is not true, attributes to the king of Italy his speaking of the Pope as *Il Vecchio della Locanda del Vaticano*. But the very pettiness of these insults recoils on their authors.<sup>1</sup>

How truly intolerable is the Pope's position in Rome is clearly shown by two or three scandalous scenes which have taken place in the city during the present pontificate and of which Mgr. de Serclaes presents us with graphic accounts. One he thus describes:

"It had been decided," writes the author, "by consent of the civil authorities, that during the night of July 13, 1881, the remains of Pius IX., should be transferred with the greatest secrecy to the place he had chosen for his burial. The government had objected to this being done solemnly, thus giving a fresh proof of the freedom and security the Papacy enjoys in Rome under the Italians. In spite of all precautions, the secret became known to the public, so that at midnight an immense crowd had collected in the square before St. Peter's to pay a last mark of respect to the great Pius IX. A plain hearse and three carriages made up the funeral procession which was followed and surrounded by a whole people. As it passed on its way, houses were spontaneously illuminated and flowers thrown on it from the open windows. One hundred thousand persons, according to hostile estimations, formed the escort of honor to the remains of Pius the Great, and countless torches lit up the scene. It was the posthumous triumph of the Pontiff who had died a victim of the revolution which

<sup>1</sup> II., 155, 157, and 160.

had tried him with all manner of insults and sorrows. Such a scene excited the anger of the sects and soon a band of rioters attacked the funeral with insulting cries and violently threatened to throw the body of Pius IX. into the Tiber. At first the police seem inclined to put a stop to the disorder, but soon ceased any effective efforts and all along the great distance that separates St. Peter's from San Lorenzo, the procession passed along amid curses, blasphemies, and the blows of a few hundred wretches. The Catholics moved on in order, disdaining with admirable patience to take notice of their assailants, though many Catholics were injured."<sup>1</sup>

However much we may admire the almost too Christian forbearance of a hundred thousand persons in presence of a few hundred roughs, it is difficult to relish it. It evokes the feeling that filled Clovis when he heard the narrative of the Crucifixion read. "Would that I had been there with my Franks." But had the Catholics of Rome retaliated, the armed force would undoubtedly have treated them as having given provocation. But all Italy not under the thumb of the Masonic Lodges protested and millions of signatures were appended to the protest, while 20,000 Italian pilgrims came to offer consolation to the Pope. And in the energetic protest which Leo XIII. made against this outrage on the memory of his predecessor, he pointed out the lesson it taught. "Let the Catholic world learn from it what security is left us in the Eternal City. . . . It will be more and more clearly understood that we can now only reside in Rome as a prisoner in the Vatican."

The revolution not seldom overreaches itself when it affords the world such object-lessons as that which it gave on the night when it danced with almost cannibal delight around the august remains of Pius IX. Seven years later, on May 9, 1889, it indulged in another such lesson when it exalted among its gods the apostate monk, Giordano Bruno, by erecting his statue in the center of the city of the Popes. The whole story of Bruno's life, of his tragic yet well-deserved end on the pile in the Campo dei Fiori in Rome, is succinctly and clearly set forth by Mgr. de T'Serclaes. In spite of the opposition of the Municipal Council of Rome to granting a site for the apostate's statue; in spite of a certain half-heartedness of the Italian ministry; in spite of the refusal of the university students of Berlin and of the official interdiction of the Austrian students to take part in the ceremony of unveiling the statue, this was at last carried out. From all parts of Italy, the followers of Satan poured into Rome, to glorify Giordano Bruno and as the *Tribuna* proclaimed, to uphold before the world "the

---

<sup>1</sup> I., 357.

gnity of Rome, the sacred (*intangible*) capital of united Italy." Let Mgr. de T'Serclaes describe what then took place:

"All the anti-clerical societies, municipalities, universities attached to the Masonic Lodges, and all kinds of sects had sent their delegates to swell the crowd that inundated the streets of the capital of Christendom. Terrible spectacle! There were thousands of men eaten up with hatred of God and of His Church. Never had the world seen such a gathering of the impious. More than six thousand societies were said to have been represented at this gathering of the impious. Some of these groups no doubt were formed for the occasion, but, even so, the number of bodies regularly organized to war against the Church was sufficiently alarming. This attempt to mobilize the forces of hell, this review of the army of Satan seemed as if it were a forerunner of the reign of him who shall rise up against God, the reign of Antichrist. . . . The procession they formed comprised ninety-seven bands of music and nineteen hundred and seventy banners grouped around a horrible standard on which Satan, the real hero of the day, was depicted. As the procession passed before the barracks of St. Catherine, the guard presented arms as if to render military honors to the demon—the chief of Masonic Italy. This fact was denied but seems authentic."

The real Romans held aloof from this satanic demonstration. Except for the procession, the streets were silent and deserted; no flags or signs of rejoicing were displayed; the military precautions taken to protect the Vatican gave the city the aspect of a place in a state of siege. What a contrast with the city a few days later, when in honor of Saints Peter and Paul every house with few exceptions was illuminated. It was a noble counter-demonstration which atoned for the triumph of Satan in the streets of Rome, and for the blasphemous cries, which, for days, the government had allowed to ring within its walls. While government organs, such as the *Capitan Fracassa* rejoiced over the Giordano Bruno demonstration, "as having killed the very soul of the Church," Signor Crispi and his colleagues feared they had allowed things to go too far. They dreaded that the Pope might in face of such insults leave Rome. Mgr. de T'Serclaes tells how they set the police spies to watch all the issues of the Vatican, and redoubled that vigilance which, as our author states, does not permit the Holy Father to walk in his garden without being watched by King Humbert's police.<sup>1</sup>

But Leo XIII. did not take a step which assuredly would have hastened the downfall of the Italian kingdom. He knows that the Holy See can afford to wait. In face of the ever renewed insults

<sup>1</sup> II., 154.

directed against his person and office, he addressed a fresh encyclical letter to the Italians on October 15, 1890, and that it might be understood by all, wrote in their tongue, "Were it only a question of ourself," he said, "if we did not see Italy menaced in its faith and rushing to its ruin, we should suffer in silence such offences." Then further on he pointed out how desirable from an Italian point of view it was that Italy should reconcile itself with the Holy See. "This conflict with the Holy See not only deprives Italy abroad of that prestige which peace with the Papacy would most certainly give it, but it estranges from it the whole Catholic world, imposes on it great burdens, and on the slightest pretext would give its enemies a weapon against itself." After pointing out all that Italy would gain by restoring to the Pontiff his independence and his sovereignty, the Pope concludes by showing that it is a calumny "to denounce Catholics and the Pontiff as enemies of Italy."

Very soon again a fresh outrage saddened the paternal heart of Leo XIII. This was the undoubtedly premeditated ill-treatment of the French pilgrims in October, 1892, and the cynical and hypocritical language of the Italian government about it. These had one happy result, for they called forth words from the Austrian Chancellor, Count Kalnoky, in the Austrian delegations, that showed that the Roman question was not closed. He called it "a difficult problem of which a satisfactory solution has not yet been found."

It were idle to speculate what that satisfactory solution will be unless we

"Can look into the seeds of time,  
And say which grain will grow and which will not."

With Mgr. de T'Serclaes we can only hint at the possible solution. "The day of [Italy's] break-up is perhaps not far off. Its unity will then crumble of itself into anarchy, but order will not be restored on the principle of unity, but on the federal principle, and not without the Pontiff, but under his auspices and with his assistance."<sup>1</sup> With an earnest prayer that Italy may soon be converted and live, we take leave of Mgr. de T'Serclaes volumes, merely adding that they are a mine of information about contemporary history. The eight chapters devoted to the Pope's action in the politico-religious affairs of France are of especial interest and value.

WILFRID C. ROBINSON.

BRUGES, BELGIUM.

---

<sup>1</sup> II, 179.

"QUID MIHI ET TIBI, MULIER?"

THE writer begs to submit a brief exposition of John ii., 4, as he understands this vexed passage.

In the first place, no honest man will find a difficulty in the application of "Mulier" applied by Christ to his Blessed Mother. In the Syro-Chaldaic tongue, which Jesus spoke, this was the accustomed manner of address to any woman and manifested no want of respect or tenderness. Christ uses the same address to Mary Magdalen at the tomb on the morning of the Resurrection. In judging of such remote events we cannot take for a criterion our social code; we must clothe them with the circumstances and social customs of the time; we must pay heed also to the idiom of the language in which they were first chronicled. As there exists no radical difference between Syro-Chaldaic and Hebrew, we may turn to the latter as the basic text in our present consideration.

The phrase was an *idiom*, and the cardinal point is to determine *what exact shade of meaning it was intended to convey in the language in which it first had origin.* The idiom occurs in Judges xi., 12, where Jephthe sends to the king of Ammon demanding: "מֶלֶךְ-לִי." Prescinding from the idiomatic meaning, the words are correctly reproduced in Greek by: "Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;" and in Latin by: "Quid mihi et tibi?" The idea, however, produced by such words in the Greek or Latin mind would not be the same as that caused in the Hebrew mind by the same words, for such is the force of an idiom that it is frequently lost by translation. Modern languages differ somewhat in reproducing this phrase. The German version of D'Allioli renders it as it occurs in St. John by: "Weib, was habe ich mit dir zu schaffen?" which might be rendered in English by: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" The French and Italian are identical in signification: "Femme, qu'y a-t il entre vous et moi?" and "Donna, che vi ha tra te e me?" In English the meaning of these words would be: "Woman, what is there between you and me?" The passage in King James' version is: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" which is evidently not a translation, but an interpretation, and, as we shall endeavor to prove, a very bad one. The Rheims-Douay version, as corrected by Challoner, is: "Woman, what is to me and to thee?" In some versions of the Rheims version is found: "Woman, what is *that* to me and to thee?" The introduction of

"that" here is an interpretation and completely perverts the signification of the phrase.

To one with even a smattering of Hebrew and Greek it is evident that Challoner's text surpasses every other modern version in the literal reproduction of the original texts. We consider the Greek in the present case as an original text, because St. John, in his Gospel, reproduced in Greek the Saviour's words spoken in Aramaic. But Challoner's version, although literal, labors under the disadvantage that, owing to the strangeness of the idiom, it conveys no clear-cut idea to our minds. The other versions, in attempting to remove this strangeness, have given us interpretations instead of translations, the words of men instead of the words of Christ. We prefer, then, the vagueness to the false concept conveyed by all the other versions. Discarding, then, all other versions, we will endeavor to bring out the Hebrew idiom, though clothed in English words, as rendered by Challoner's text.

All such phrases have a *great, general signification, which becomes modified by the context in its different applications*. We place, then, as our foundation, in dealing with this expression, that *by it the one speaking demands a reason for some action or tenor of conduct directed towards himself*—that is, the one uttering those words asks a cause for the line of action which the person addressed is adopting towards the speaker. Now, it depends on the context whether an indignant expostulation or calm interrogation be conveyed by the words. In the passage in Judges, referred to in the beginning, Jephthe asks cause why the king of Ammon should make war upon him and devastate his land. The basic sense of the words, that we have determined above, fits exactly here: Jephthe asks cause for a line of action used towards him. Similarly, in II. Samuel, xvi., 10 (commonly called Second Kings), where Abisai, the son of Sarvia, would slay Semei, who was cursing David, the holy king demands reason for such slaying in this exact phrase: "Quid mihi et vobis, filii Sarvia?" This, in the present case, would be equivalent to saying in our tongue: "Why such actions towards me, O sons of Sarvia?" Evidently the words here convey no harshness or disrespect, as they are addressed to one of David's own defenders, who, through zeal for the king's honor, would slay his opponent. They express, it is true, disapproval, but the disapproval of the suggestion of a zealous friend. The words in the same sense are again directed towards Abisai in the 22d verse of the xix. chapter of the same book.

A yet more striking example of the fundamental signification is found in I. Kings, xvii., 18 (III. Kings, xvii., 18). Elias is har-bored by the widow of Sarephta. Her son falls ill, and it soon appears that a mortal disease is preying upon his vitals. The grief-



icken mother turns to Elias, and, attributing the cause of her son's death to his presence, asks concerning his action towards her in the idiom: "*Quid mihi et tibi, vir Dei?*" Here the expression under consideration can admit of no other interpretation than that of being an interrogation to know the cause of the line of action which the speaker believed to be practiced towards herself. In *I Kings*, iii., 13 (*IV. Kings*, iii., 13), when Joram, king of Israel, sought to know from Eliseus the event of his war against Moab, the prophet made answer: "*Quid mihi et tibi est? Vade ad prophetas patris tui et matris tue.*" Here Eliseus asks with scorn why the idolatrous king of Israel should come to him, and we could render the sense of the sentence by: "What wouldst thou do to me?" or, "Why comest thou to me? Go to the prophets of thy father and thy mother." The scorn here is not essentially implied in the phrase, but results from the context.

In the second book of *Paralipomenon*, xxxv., 21, the same expression appears in its unvarying fundamental signification, but the tone is conciliatory. Nechao, king of Egypt, sends a friendly message to Josias, king of Juda, advising him that he is not making war upon him and asks, in the oft-quoted phrase, why Josias is assembling hosts to make head against him. The only places where the idiom occurs in the New Testament, besides the one under consideration, is where the demons address our Lord, who about to eject them from the energumens. In every one of these passages, *Math.* viii., 29, *Luke* viii., 28, *iv.*, 34, *Mark* i., 24, 27, the demons ask concerning Jesus' conduct towards them. There is a mingling of railing hate and despair in the phrase in the mouths of the demons, but this is accidental, not from the essential nature of the words. After the consideration of all these texts, we repeat our fundamental position that the phrase asks a cause for the line of action which the one addressed employs towards the speaker. This basic meaning would be naturally by the context shaded and drawn to cognate meanings springing from its original signification. We have seen clear evidence that its tone may be scornful or conciliatory, angry or friendly, in different circumstances.

We come now to examine the text of *St. John*, in the light of our previous scrutiny. We shall apply the fundamental signification to the phrase as it there occurs. The wine at the marriage-feast has failed, and as Mary was one of the inner circle of friends, the defect is made known to her. Knowing her Son's almighty power, she approaches Him, and makes known to Him the distressing occurrence. She plainly, by her action, shows forth that she believes that, if He will, He can afford a remedy. There is a quaint beauty in Mary's words: "They have no wine." The full



extent of Mary's relations with Jesus, we, upon this bank and shoal of time, can never know. How much she shared of the thoughts and designs of the God-Man is hid and barred from mortal sense. Although the field of conjecture be vast, we will refrain: conjectures help not in a scientific interpretation. But it seems not conjecture to say that Mary knew that her Son could supply the failing wine, else why her bootless message to Him? Impelled then by such conviction, she comes to Him and announces the simple fact. Now this can be called *Mary's line of action* for which Jesus asks cause, and as we have already shown, his asking cause for such action implies not by virtue of the phrase any repulse. We will venture to here place in Christ's mouth what we believe to have actuated Him in His response to Mary: "O, woman, why comest thou to me in this need? Thou knowest that only by appealing to my almighty power could I remedy this defect. Now the time has not yet come to establish my title to the coequal Sonship of God, by manifestations of my divine power. I have not become Incarnate to work miracles for the advantage of our kinsfolk and acquaintances. The divine design, in harmony with which my human will always works, is that I remain hid until my entrance on my public life. Then I will perform works so that I can say, 'if ye believe not my words, believe my works.' But these miracles shall be performed for no private end or emolument, but to prove that the Father and I are one in nature as we are one in power." These words though said ostensibly to Mary, were said to us. We were the ones to be taught the scope of Christ's miracles.

Had Christ not performed the miracle we could rest here. But Mary takes the answer for an affirmation, and Christ, in seeming contradiction to his words, changeth the water into wine. Before answering this heavy objection, we take for granted the truth of the mystery of mysteries, the harmonious concurrence of man's free will and God's eternal prescience, and consequent eternal decrees. Christ as man was endowed with free will; free, while always in consonance with His divine will. He was free, therefore, to begin His public life when He should please. When, therefore, He says to Mary, that His time was not yet come, He means this in relation to the *end* for which His miracles should be wrought. He does not imply that there was any absolute fixed date, before which He could not begin His public life; but rather that His miracle-working should be a part and factor in the great drama of Redemption, and not for private ends done in the interest of his family or friends. It was a fitting preface to the wondrous deed to show our dull senses that Christ worked those wonders not for private interests, but as a necessary element in the

onomy of salvation. Being free, then, to begin at any time, He began His public life with this miracle, as St. John says: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and He manifested His glory, and His disciples believed in him." We say then that Jesus, who was free to begin His public life at any time, began it here at Mary's solicitation; that He prefaced the miracle with a solemn declaration that it was not for private ends, but as a factor in the scheme of Redemption; and that Mary understood Him perfectly and acted in accordance. We believe that this is an adequate explanation of the difficulty in the second clause. Were it necessary, we might go further and say, that even though Jesus did not intend to begin His public life at that particular time, He changed his mind at Mary's petition, and anticipated, by a short period, the point at which He would otherwise have begun. Hence we assert Christ's free human will, this must result; for there can be no liberty without exemption from necessity. We are confirmed in this view by the fact that the best exegetists held that Christ after His resurrection changed His mind in regard to the place of appearing to the Apostles. On the morning of His Resurrection, He says to Mary Magdalen and the other Mary (Math. xxvii., 10): "Fear not, go ye, announce to the brethren that they go into Galilee, *there* they shall see me." The angel also in Mark, xvi., 7, affirms the same: "But go say to the disciples and Peter that he (Jesus), goes before you into Galilee, *there* you shall see him as He said to you." Jesus had promised this (Mark xiv., 28): "But after I shall have arisen, I will go before you into Galilee." But contrary to all these promises, Jesus first appeared to the Apostles "as they were at table" in Jerusalem (Luke xxiv., 33, 36). The only satisfactory explanation for this is, that Jesus had originally intended to manifest himself first in Galilee; but, with the freedom of a free moral agent, he changed this first design and appeared first in Jerusalem. And so it results that this verse far from being prejudicial to Mary, exalts her, and brings out more clearly her part in the drama that saved the world.

A. E. BREEN, D.D.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

## Scientific Chronicle.

### PETROLEUM.

#### AN HISTORICAL SKETCH.

PROBABLY most of those who have waded through the "Scientific Chronicle" of this REVIEW for October and January last, feel that they have had about enough of oil, perhaps even an over-dose. But having spoken of the animal and vegetable kinds, we cannot bear to tear ourselves entirely away from the subject of oils without at least a word on the third and last kind, the so-called mineral oil. Relying therefore on the well-known patience of our readers, we feel that we may venture to administer just one mild dose more. We have, however, for the consolation of all concerned, registered a solemn promise that this infliction shall be the last in this matter.

The word *Petroleum*, derived from the Latin, *petrae oleum* (oil of the rock), has been used by many writers in a very wide sense to embrace every kind of bituminous substance found in the earth, whether solid, semi-solid, liquid, or gaseous. Others, however, apply the term to the liquid forms only, and use the word *Bitumen* for the generic name of the semi-solids, and *Asphaltum* for the solids. In the nomenclature of the subject there has been at times considerable confusion. We shall try to clear it up, to some extent, in the following table, which has been made out with the aid of the best authorities at hand, and it is probably fairly correct, as far as it goes.

This list, though incomplete, will, we think, enable us to recognize our substance almost anywhere, and that is all we need so far.

To enter into the details of the physical and chemical properties of petroleum, of its mode of occurrence, its origin, its uses, etc., however interesting it might be in itself, would require a good many issues of this REVIEW all to itself. Men, it is true, are born selfish (except when they happen to be twins), and they hardly ever get entirely cured; but we are not quite selfish enough to wish to monopolize the REVIEW, and so we shall stick to our title: "An Historical Sketch."

The literature is quite extensive. Ever since the days of Herodotus (450 B. C.) we find an almost continuous stream of authors, some of whom have merely mentioned the matter in passing, while from the pens of others have come long treatises showing careful and patient investigations. It has even been stated that long before the time of Herodotus, mention is made of petroleum in the Bible. Whether indeed the Bible is the first to mention it, or even whether the Bible mentions it at all, is not a matter of much consequence, but the choice of the text intended to illustrate the assertion seems to have been a very unhappy one.

TONGUE.	LIQUID.	SEMI-SOLID.	SOLID.
Hebrew .....	.....	.....	Hemar, kofer.
Babylonian.....	.....	.....	Mur, aschir.
Persian .....	Rhadinance, nafta, na- fata, naphtha, nefsgil.	.....	.....
Assyrian .....	.....	.....	Kupru, amaru, ididu.
Syrian .....	.....	.....	Abu thabun.
Greek .....	.....	Asphaltos.	.....
Roman .....	Bitumen liquidum, bitu- men candidum, naph- tha flos bituminis, pe- troleum.	Pittolium, pissasphal- tus, maltha, bitumen,	.....
Arabian.....	Hara sakir,	.....	Chumel, humar, el humar.
Indian.....	Yenan.	.....	.....
Japanese.....	Sakinoy, seki-schitza.	.....	Dore, kioei, te- ire, kisa.
Chinese.....	Schi-yu.	.....	.....
Spanish.....	Petroleo.	Brea.	.....
Slavonian.....	Ropa, ropianka.	Kendebal.	Smola.
Roumanian....	Pekureti,	.....	.....
German.....	Erdoel, steinoel, naphta, petroleum.	.....	Erdhartz, erd- pech, asphatt. Judenpech.
French .....	Bitume liquide, huile naphthe, huile de pe- trole.	Bitume visqueux, bi- tume glutineux, poix mineral, min- eral graisse.	Goudron min- eral, bitume compacte, as- phalte.
English .....	Rock oil, naphtha, earth oil, mineral oil, crude oil.	Earth tar, mineral tar, maltha, pitch, bitu- men.	Mineral wax, mineral pitch, asphaltum, ozokerite.

The case is thus stated by William T. Brannt in his recent work on Petroleum: "The first notice of it (petroleum) we find in the Bible, being stated in the Second Book of Maccabees, Chapter I., that when the Jews were led into Persia they found pits in which the priests concealed the sacred fire they required for their sacrifices. After many years their grandchildren, contemporaries of the prophet Nehemiah, searched for the concealed fire and found an oil which, when poured on the hot sacrificial stone, burst into a huge flame. The Jews enclosed these pits, and, designating them holy, applied to them the term *nephtar* or *nephtoj*, a place of expiation or forgiveness, from which the word *naphtha* is derived."

In spite of that "huge flame," this account is, to say the least, cool; we might even call it refreshing. Though not much given to polemics, we think this covert attack on the veracity of the Sacred Scriptures should not be allowed to pass without a challenge, and hence in the interest of the truth only we don our coat-of-mail just here. To properly understand the whole case, it will be necessary to quote from the reference given above the two passages which bear on the subject. They are contained in the five verses (18 to 22) and the six verses (31 to 36) inclusively: "Therefore whereas we purpose to keep the purification of the temple on the five and twentieth day of the month of Casleu, we

thought it necessary to signify it to you: that you also may keep the day of Scenopogia, the day of the fire, that was given when Nehemias offered sacrifice, after the temple and altar was built. For when our fathers were led into Persia, the priests that then were worshippers of God, took privately the fire from the altar, and hid it in a valley where there was a deep pit without water, and there they kept it safe, so that the place was unknown to all men. But when many years had passed, and it pleased God that Nehemias should be sent by the king of Persia, he sent some of the posterity of those priests that had hid it to seek for the fire: and as they told us, they found no fire, but thick water. Then he bade them draw it up, and bring it to him: and the priest Nehemias commanded the sacrifices that were laid on, to be sprinkled with the same water, both the wood and the things that were laid on it. And when this was done, and the time was come that the sun shone out, which before was in a cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered. . . . And when the sacrifice was consumed, Nehemias commanded the water that was left to be poured upon the great stones. Which being done, there was kindled a flame from them; but it was consumed by the light that shined from the altar. And when this matter became public, it was told to the king of Persia, that in the place where the priests that were led away had hid the fire, there appeared water, with which Nehemias and they that were with him had purified the sacrifices. And the king considering, and diligently examining the matter, made a temple for it, that he might prove what had happened. And when he had proved it, he gave the priests many goods, and divers presents, and he took and distributed them to them with his own hand. And Nehemias called this place Nephthar, which is interpreted purification." (Douay Bible.)

This account differs, as will be perceived, in several important particulars, from the one given by our author. In the first place, Brannt says that those who were sent to seek for the fire found an *oil*, while the Bible says they found "*thick water*," *aquam crassam*. Now Brannt's work is published in Philadelphia, and the author should surely have known that even Schuylkill water, which has the reputation of being pretty thick at times, is never, even at its worst, called "oil." Still we do not want to lay any undue stress on this, and we freely admit that the word water is sometimes used in the general sense of "liquid." We let that pass, therefore, and come to the next point, which is more serious.

In the second place, the Bible says that this thick water was thrown on the wood and on the offerings, and that when the sun came out it took fire. Brannt conveniently passes over this statement without mentioning it at all. He probably saw that it would be too difficult to find an oil which would take fire by mere exposure to sunlight. We are not aware that such an oil has ever been heard of, and we can afford to wait calmly for further information. We have, it is true, some very inflammable oils derived from petroleum, the vapors of which in the open air would burst into flame from the touch of a lighted match, or from the

spark of a steel and flint ; but if merely poured on a wood-pile, instead of setting it on fire, they would evaporate so rapidly as to cool the wood down very considerably. About this no physicist can have the ghost of a doubt.

Thirdly, Brannt states that the oil was poured on the hot sacrificial stone. We would like to know how that stone came to be hot, especially as the Jews were not allowed to make any other fire before the sacred fire had been first kindled. Was it perchance because the day, as the Bible says, had been cloudy up to the moment of the sacrifice? It would seem to require a very unscientific use of the imagination to invent such a folly as that. No, there must have been a fire to heat the stone, if, as Brannt says, it *was* hot. Of course, if there had been such a fire previously, and if any little flame still remained, even crude petroleum might be ignited thereby, but the difficulty just now is about what started the first fire, and this is not solved by slyly ignoring it.

Fourthly, the Bible evidently records the occurrence as a miracle, for in this account, the Jews of Jerusalem were writing to their brethren of Egypt and exhorting them to keep (holy) the day of the fire that was given when Nehemias offered sacrifice ; and the Jews everywhere have kept it holy ever since. It would be altogether too absurd to imagine that a festival was instituted for the perpetual remembrance of the fact that a highly inflammable oil took fire when set on fire by another fire already kindled. Again, "there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered." Truly, it is no wonder that they wondered, believing, as they evidently did, that the liquid was real water. But even if it had been petroleum, the materialistic view of the case would not be advanced one bit, for, once again, no one ever heard of petroleum taking fire spontaneously.

Another statement which shows that the whole occurrence was miraculous is contained in verse 32, where it is said that the flame which rose from the stones was consumed by the light that shined from the altar, that is, there shone from the altar itself a glory which overpowered the light from the burning liquid, whatever that liquid may have been.

Such being the case, the affair naturally caused a stir abroad, and was looked upon as so remarkable that the king of Persia himself, Artaxerxes Longimanus, who was no fool, thought it worth his while to investigate the matter, and he did so, thoroughly. After diligent examination and careful consideration, he was satisfied as to the truth of the reports which had been brought to him, and especially as to the fact that it was water and not oil that had been used. He thereupon built a temple (an enclosure) around the spring to preserve it as a holy place, and then with his own hand distributed many valuable presents to the priests, in order to honor those whom Jehovah had honored by a double miracle.

"And Nehemias called this place Nephthar which is interpreted purification." The Septuagint calls the *substance*, not the *place*, Nephthar, but that is immaterial. Several explanations of this part of the text have been offered, one of which is the following: The Jews, during their captivity in Babylon, where petroleum, both in the solid and the

liquid state, had long been known, had seen the pagans employ it in their sacrificial rites, and had seen it set on fire. They had become acquainted with the word *naphthar*, or *nephtar*, or whatever word the Babylonians then used for petroleum, and so when Nehemias saw the liquid which he poured on the offerings take fire, he very naturally employed the term which he had heard employed on similar occasions in Babylon. The Babylonian word *naphthar* did not mean "forgiveness," but came from the Persian or Median word *nafata* or *neftgil*, "*to exude*."

One more remark, and we have done with this. William Smith in his "Dictionary of the Bible" (art. *Naphthar*), says that the place from which the liquid in question was drawn "has been identified with the large well called by the Arabs, Bir-eyub, situated beneath Jerusalem, at the confluence of the valleys of Kidron and Hinnon with the Wady-en-Nar (valley of fire), and from which the main water supply of the city is obtained." The water supply of a city drawn from a petroleum spring! That is a little too strong. This well is just a step or two southeast of Jerusalem. It is now called En-Rogel, and on good authority, has, ever since the days of Josue, either contained water or has been dry, according to the season. We can find no account in history of the finding of petroleum at or near Jerusalem. Therefore the water of Nehemias was water and not petroleum. If, however, we are very anxious to find mention of petroleum in the Bible, we may, perhaps, be satisfied with the text of Job (xxix., 6): "When I washed my feet with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil."

But let us back to business. We had started to say, before we were interrupted by that Bible question, that Herodotus has left on record what he knew about petroleum. He wrote of the springs in the island of Zacynthus, now Zante: "I have myself seen pitch drawn up out of a lake and from water in Zacynthus; and there are several lakes there; the largest of them is seventy feet every way, and two orgyæ (fathoms?) in depth; into this they let down a pole with a myrtle branch fastened to the end, and then draw up pitch adhering to the myrtle; it has the smell of asphalt, but is in other respects, better than the pitch of Pieria. They pour it into a cistern, dug near the lake, and when they have collected a sufficient quantity they pour it off from the cisterns into jars." Again, he says: "Eight days' journey from Babylon stands another city called Is (the modern Hit) on a small river of the same name which discharges its stream into the Euphrates. Now this river brings down with its waters many lumps of bitumen, from whence the bitumen used in the wall of Babylon was brought."

This solid or semi-solid petroleum was used, according to Genesis (xi., 3), as a cement in the building of the tower of Babel, and the same is doubtless true of the glorious palaces of Ninevah. But the springs of Hit supplied also a liquid bitumen, called by the Persians *nafta*, and by the Turks *hara sakir*. These springs are well known even now, and have often been visited by European travellers on the overland journey to the Indies.



Strabo (50 B.C.), tells us about the occurrence of bitumen in the valley of Judea, and how after an earthquake-shock it used to rise, and float in lumps on the surface of the Dead Sea. He likewise tells of the trade in this material kept up by an Arab, named Nabathenes, with the Egyptians, who made use of it in embalming their mummies. Diodorus Sicily, about the same time, describes the lake Asphaltites, and says that the savages of that island had no other commerce except with the same Egyptians, and that it consisted solely in the traffic in bitumen, or asphalt.

Aristotle (384 B.C.), and Plutarch, Pliny, and Josephus, all in the first century of the Christian era, describe in turn, the deposits of bitumen occurring in Albania on the eastern shores of the Adriatic Sea, while petroleum springs and gas wells have been known in China from time immemorial. The wells of Baku, on the Caspian Sea, with their almost constantly burning streams of oil, have been known for ages, and have been described by many travellers, among others by the celebrated Marco Polo (A.D. 1250); and as we come down to more modern times the references become more numerous, but we must leave them and hurry on.

In North America the early explorers became acquainted with petroleum principally through the Indians. The earliest record we have is that left by the Franciscan missionary, Joseph de la Roche D'Allion, who in 1629 crossed the Niagara River into what is now the State of New York. He makes mention of certain oil springs existing at that spot, and says that the Indian name of the place means "there is plenty here."

Again on a map bearing the date of 1670, a *Fontaine de Bitume* is indicated near what is now the village of Cuba, N. Y., and oil, as is well known, is found there at the present day.

The Seneca Indians who occupied the southwestern part of New York and the northeastern part of Pennsylvania, set great value on their springs on Oil Creek and in the neighboring valleys, and used the oil not only as a medicine, but also in their religious observances. The French commander of Fort Duquesne, writing in 1750 to General Montcalm, says: "I would desire to assure you that this is a most delightful land. Some of the most astonishing natural wonders have been discovered by our people. While descending the Allegheny, fifteen leagues below the mouth of the Conewango and three above the Senango, we were invited by the chief of the Senecas to attend a religious ceremony of his tribe. We landed and drew up our canoes on a point where a small stream entered the river. The tribe appeared unusually solemn. We marched up the stream about half a league, where the company, a band it appeared had arrived some days before. Gigantic hills begirt us on every side. The scene was really sublime. The great chief then recited the conquests and heroism of his ancestors. The surface of the stream was covered with a thick scum, which, upon applying torch at a given signal, burst into a complete conflagration. At the sight of the flames the Indians gave forth the triumphant shout that



made the hills and valleys re-echo again. Here then, is revived the ancient fire worship of the East; here, then, are the children of the sun."

In 1755 Lewis Evans, of Philadelphia, published "A General Map of the Middle Colonies of America," indicating the existence of petroleum along the Allegheny and Ohio rivers, and about the same time, Peter Kalm, a Swede, published a book of travels, in which was a map giving the correct locations of the springs on Oil Creek. Thirty-four years later (1789) in the "Massachusetts Magazine" we find the following "In the northern part of Pennsylvania is a creek called Oil Creek, which empties into the Allegheny River. It issues from a spring, on which floats an oil similar to that called Barbadoes tar, and from which one may gather several gallons in a day. The troops sent to guard the western posts halted at this spring, collected some of the oil, and bathed their joints with it. This gave them great relief from the rheumatism with which they were afflicted. The water, of which the troops drank freely, operated as a gentle purge."

Somewhat later, but still in the last century, springs of petroleum were discovered in West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky, according as settlers began to establish themselves beyond the Allegheny mountains. Up to the beginning of the present century, however, little interest was manifested in petroleum, and the commerce in it was a small affair, but between 1800 and 1850 there was a wonderful awakening. Explorers for petroleum girt themselves around and started the echoes in nearly every part of the known world. The consequence was that new sources were discovered, and old ones that had been neglected or forgotten were rediscovered. Some of these "finds" have yielded and are still yielding immense quantities of oil; others from the outset gave very little promise and kept it faithfully; others that promised well at first, proved to be deficient in staying qualities, and have been abandoned.

About this time also chemists began to examine the oils from different localities, in order to find out something about their composition, and to learn how to purify them so as to rid them of their disagreeable odors, and to separate them into their constituents so as to open up for them uses and applications unknown before. During the decade from 1840 to 1850 both prospecting and analyzing were pushed with remarkable vigor, but the birth of the real petroleum industry did not take place till August 28, 1859, on which date oil was first reached by a well bored for that express purpose. Prior to this time wells had, indeed, been bored, but it was in order to obtain brine for the manufacture of salt.

However, as the wells bored for brine were the legitimate precursors of those that were afterwards bored for oil, we think it well to describe the first boring for salt. It took place in the region now called West Virginia, at the "Salt Lick," otherwise called the "Great Buffalo Lick," on account of the vast herds of buffalo, elk, and other ruminants that came there regularly through "Thoroughfare Gap" for their supply of salt. The Indian name of the place, "Kanawha," has been retained

the present day. The buffalo discovered the salt, the red man discovered the buffalo, the white man discovered the red man, and having persuaded both him and the buffalo to retire, the white man, under the bad seal of "Squatter Sovereignty," took possession of the salt. It was not solid salt, however, but only salt water, and not very salt at all.

Now, in 1806, the brothers, David and Joseph Ruffner, feeling, as the buffaloes before them had felt, a strong yearning for more salt, undertook to get down to the source, or "first principles" as it were. To do so by open digging was found impossible on account of the oozy nature of the soil through which the brine made its slow way to the surface. The brothers therefore, procured a straight, hollow "gum-tree" (sycamore) of an internal diameter of four feet; having sawn it square at both ends, they set it in an upright position, and secured it by braces on all sides, thus forming a veritable caisson. A platform, which two men could stand, was built at the top, and a tall post carrying a well-pole or swape, was planted hard by. A whiskey barrel, that had lost its vocation from having become empty, was cut in two, across the middle, and thus supplied the engineers with a couple of strong, buckets. One of these was hung in the caisson by a rope fastened to the well-pole, while the other stood by in mute but open-mouthed wonder, waiting for a job, and perhaps reviling the partiality of this all too hollow world. Imagination struggles vainly to portray the feelings of that other bucket when it found itself the very center of so tremendous an enterprise, and mayhap looked down from time to time with despised its less favored brother. Next, a knight in full armor of pickaxe, shovel and crowbar was lowered down to the base of operations in the bottom of the gum tree, while two men were stationed on the platform to empty the bucket, and three or four supplied the energy necessary for working the swape. Ventilation in the caisson seems to have been kept up by vigorous shouting, sometimes on matters totally irrelevant to the work in hand. As the digging progressed, the caisson, of course lowered, until at last it came to anchor on the rock, at a depth of 18 feet. After a deal of trouble, the caisson was made to fit the irregular rock-surface tight enough to exclude outside water, and when it was found that brine, in very small quantities indeed, but fairly strong, was actually coming up through the rock itself. The quality of the brine was encouraging, but the rock was discouraging. The brothers wanted to get down through that rock, but neither Indians nor buffaloes had left any precedent to work by. However, after the severe mental efforts, a new idea was hatched in the brains of the men, and they consequently decided to try drilling. To make a hole, by mere hand-drilling, large enough to be of any service, and to a depth yet entirely problematical, was of course, out of the question, but the inventive ingenuity of the men soon hit on the following expedient: the heavy well-pole was discarded, and in its place a light springy one was substituted. To this, was slung a long iron rod, the lower end of which carried a  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inch steel chisel-bit. The outer end of the pole was

pulled down by means of a rope in the hands of the workmen. This action raised the drill, and when the rope was released, the drill, bearing the full weight of the rod, fell, and delivered its blow. As the hole became deeper, new lengths of rod were welded on, till, by pegging away patiently for four months and a-half, they reached, on January 15, 1888, a depth of 40 feet in the rock itself, from which now flowed a plentiful supply of strong brine. The success of this undertaking encouraged others, and soon drilling or, as it is often called, boring became common. We have related this case somewhat in detail, not only because it is the first instance of drilling, in contradistinction to digging, but also because to Kanawha is due the credit of having educated and sent forth skilled well-borers all over the land, who have bored for water for irrigation on the western plains, for artesian wells for city factory, and private use, for brine in many places, and later on for oil, not only in America, but in other parts of the world.

Among those however, who did not go forth, but remained at home, "Billy" Morris must not be forgotten. He had handled many a swape rope and had noticed that when the boring had reached a certain depth the long iron drill-rod would get bent by the percussion of its own fall, and hence would bind more or less against the sides of the hole; and that besides when a drill got stuck, it was awfully hard work to loosen again; and the deeper the hole the worse these difficulties became. Others had often noticed the same thing, and had relieved their feelings by certain unprofessional remarks, more picturesque than ethical, but Billy gathered his wits into a lump, and invented the tool called the "slips" or "jars." They are made like two exaggeratedly long links of a flat chain, fitting closely sideways, but free to slide loosely up and down. They are 6 feet 3 inches long when closed, but stretch out to 7 feet 4 inches when fully opened. Their use will be made known further down.

Though perhaps somewhat out of place logically, we feel the need of inserting at this point such description as we may be able to give of the whole operation of drilling, as it is done in modern practice.

*First.*—There must be a derrick suitable for handling the various tools. This is usually a square, open structure of heavy timbers, in the form of a pyramid, and measuring about 25 feet each way at the bottom and 4 or 5 at the top. The height is about 70 feet. Since a complete "string" of tools is about 60 feet in length, real drilling is not supposed to begin till that depth has been reached. Getting down to that point is considered as mere preparation.

*Second.*—The derrick being in place, an iron pipe, 8 inches in diameter, shod with sharp steel, is driven, like a pile, down as far as it can be made to go. If this be the full 60 feet, all is well; if more than 60 feet, all the better. Sometimes a depth of 200 feet or more is attained by this drive-pipe alone, and then the oil men smile a smile of sweet content. If, however, the drive-pipe, before reaching the 60 foot horizon, effectually resists the gentle persuasion of the 1-ton wooden maul, the heavy drill, the full size of the bore, is lowered into the pipe. The drill

then raised a few feet by suitable machinery in the derrick above, and fall suddenly; and this pounding is kept up till some progress has been made. The pipe is then driven a little further, and this alternation of drilling and pounding goes on till the requisite 60-foot depth is reached. The 8-inch bit is now removed, and the complete string of tools is lowered into the hole. In the following list we give them in their proper order, beginning with the lowest.

Tool.	Length.	Diameter.	Weight.
Drill, or Bit .....	3 feet 3 inches.	5½ inches.	140 pounds.
Auger Stem .....	30 "	5½ "	1020 "
Jars, or Jars .....	7 " 4 "	5½ "	320 "
Sinker Bar .....	18 " 6 "	3½ "	540 "
Rope Socket .....	3 " 6 "	3½ "	80 "
Rope, or Cable .....	?	?	?
Temper Screw .....	4 "	.....	145 "
Total .....	66 feet 1 inch.	.....	2245 pounds.

Let us now get down to the bottom of that hole, in spirit, and work our way slowly up. The lower end, or cutting portion of the *bit* is a double-beveled chisel of hardened steel. Its upper end is threaded so as to screw into the auger stem above it. The *auger stem*, which is of iron, is threaded in the same way to fit the lower link of the jars. Its object in life is two-fold: first, by its great weight, to help the bit strike an effective blow; secondly, by its length, to serve as a guide for the jars, which, left to its own vagaries, might stray from the road of rectitude and go exploring laterally on its own account. This would never do, since, in order to prevent the ingress of water and sand at points above the oil strata, it is usually necessary to line the hole with iron piping, and a crooked hole could not be so lined. Secondly, even if a well flow oil abundantly at the outset, the flow will almost surely, sooner or later, cease, and then recourse must be had to pumping; but a pump could not be lowered through a crooked hole.

The *jars* come next. The lower half of the jars is screwed fast to the auger stem, and its weight, say 160 pounds, is added to that of the stem and bit, making in all a total striking weight of 1320 pounds. The upper half of the jars is made fast to the sinker bar, but we shall leave the description of their action till we get up out of that hole.

The *sinker bar* is merely an iron rod, whose size and weight have been already given in the table. Its purpose will be made clear in a few moments.

The *rope socket* is an iron tube whose object is to grip the lower two feet of the rope or cable firmly without danger of cutting or chafing it off. This is the only practical way of fastening the rope, as there is not room enough in the hole to bend the rope around an eye and splice it.

Following the rope up we reach the open air and take a breath.

Here we meet the *temper screw*, a very ingenious contrivance for connecting the rope with the *walking beam* which oscillates up and down over the hole. If the rope, properly adjusted as to length, were fastened directly to the walking beam, it would be found too short as soon as the drill had made a few inches of headway. Instead of this arrangement, the rope, which is often nearly  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile long, may be gripped at any point of its length by a strong clamp which is fastened to the lower end of the temper screw, while its upper, free portion, runs to the top of the derrick over a pulley there, and then down to a drum, called the *bull wheel*. The purpose of the bull wheel is to lower the string of tools into the hole, or raise them out, as occasion may require. Finally, the top part of the frame in which the temper screw runs is hung on the hook of the walking beam, the screw itself being run up to its highest point.

Let us now adjust our string of tools to the proper working length and start up. First, the whole string, exclusive of the temper screw, is lowered by the bull wheel till the bit just strikes the bottom. Everything is then taut, with the jaws open to their fullest reach. The rope is then slacked four inches more, and this leaves the jars loose to just that amount. The business-end of the walking beam, with the temper screw depending from it, is next brought down to its lowest position, and the rope is then securely gripped by the clamp of the temper screw. The end of the rope that runs to the bull wheel is slacked off enough to allow free play to the tools. The walking beam has a play of 24 inches. During the first four inches of its ascent it raises the temper screw, the rope, the rope socket, the sinker bar and the upper half of the jars, a weight of 925 pounds and the weight of the rope besides. The momentum of that moving mass is not to be trifled with, and consequently, when the upper half of the jars takes a pull on the lower half, it does so with a jerk or upward blow, sudden enough to loosen or "jar" the bit from its hold in the rock, even if it be pretty badly wedged in, whereas a steady pull would be of little avail.

The walking beam then carries the entire string up the remaining 20 inches. Now, a body falling freely would make that distance of 20 inches in about  $\frac{1}{3}$  of a second; but the beam is forced down a little faster than that, and hence the upper half of the string gets the start on the lower half and keeps it, so that the bit with its load (1320 pounds) has a free fall of 20 inches, and delivers a clear, sharp, cutting blow. The energy in this case amounts to 2200 foot-pounds, and this, concentrated on the thin edge of a hard steel chisel-bit, will enable the bit to gradually bite its way into the hardest rock. It will be at once evident that the jars are not only an important tool, but the very heart of the drilling set; and it is to Billy Morris that we owe them. We therefore entirely agree with Dr. J. P. Hale, of Charleston, W. Va., who says: "Billy Morris never patented his invention, and never asked for nor made a dollar out of it, but as a public benefactor, he deserves to rank with the inventors of the sewing-machine, reaping-machine, planing-machine, printing-cylinders, cotton-gin," etc. It is this tool which has

rendered deep boring possible, and it has been adopted wherever such work is required to be done.

The use of the temper-screw has not yet been made clear. Well, while that bit is pounding away, the hole is getting deeper, and consequently the "play" of the jars is getting less, so that in a short time the bit would no longer reach the rock, but would content itself, as many Christians do, with good intentions, and merely beat the air. To obviate this, the "borer," by means of a short double-handed lever, keeps backing the screw downwards, according as the bit progresses, and at the same time keeps turning the whole system around from right to left and from left to right, so that the bit may make a round hole, and not be liable to get stuck fast. The temper-screw has a run of four feet, and when it has been worked out to its full stretch the hole in the rock has reached the same depth. The rope may now be let out to that amount, and the temper-screw adjusted as at the start; but if the work is on solid rock, it will be time to clean out the pulverized material from the hole; this is done by means of the sand-pump, and then a new start is made for another stretch.

A string of tools, complete, is valued at about \$900. By their use, wells have been bored to great depths. Experience has shown that oil may exist at depths separated from each other by perfectly impermeable strata of clay or rock; and often, when a well has apparently been exhausted, a deeper drilling has developed a second, and a still deeper one a third, "horizon" of oil-bearing sand; and we know not but that there may yet be deeper depths to be reached by and by. As far as we are aware, however, up to date, the Watson well, at Titusville, is the most profound, its depth being 3553 feet, or over two-thirds of a mile.

Our history has, perhaps, been getting a trifle too technical, but, undertaking quite innocently to describe a machine, is something like taking hold of an electric-light or trolley-wire—you never know when you are going to let go again.

Getting back to that first boring for brine by the Ruffner brothers, we learn that not only brine, but also a small quantity of petroleum was obtained. In wells bored subsequently, not only there, but in many other places, petroleum often accompanied the brine in considerable quantities. Except for the little used in medicine, it was considered a great nuisance and allowed to run to waste. For instance, in 1829, the famous "American" well was bored near the bed of the Little Rennox creek, at Burkesville, Ky. *The Niles' Register* gives an account, of which the substance is as follows: In boring for brine, a vein of pure oil was struck. The oil "gushed" to a height of 30 feet above the ground, and flowed away into the Cumberland river, on which it was traced nearly 100 miles. About two miles below the well, the oil was set on fire by a boy (oh! the boy! but tradition has it that he grew up to be a man, and fought on the right side in the Civil War afterwards), and for 56 miles the river was one mass of seething flame and curling clouds of smoke. Those who witnessed the scene, testified that they had never

before looked on such a sight, and never expected to again—at least in this world. At the beginning this well gave 1000 barrels of oil a day, and for more than thirty years it was still supplying oil plentifully. After a while, the waste was stopped; the oil was bottled up, and “American Medicinal Oil, Burkesville, Kentucky,” was known all through this country, and in many parts of Europe. But, as a brine-well, the “American” was not a success. Several other brine-wells had to be abandoned because of too much oil, just as, later on, oil-wells were abandoned because of too much brine, though, paradoxical as it may appear, it is easier to separate brine from oil than to separate oil from brine.

In the early part of the decade, 1850 to 1860, attention was being seriously called to petroleum as an illuminant. The supply of sperm oil was showing signs of falling off, and yet the world was shouting for “light, more light”—but there was an episode worth recalling here. In the difficulty of too little sperm oil, and not enough of anything to replace it, a substance yecept “*Burning Fluid*” was introduced, and made frantic efforts to obtain a permanent footing. To the world of commerce it is dead, buried, and forgotten, long ago, but our recollection is that it was a mixture of three parts of alcohol with one part of turpentine. Turpentine, when burnt alone, gives a horribly smoky flame. This smoke is mainly carbon in a very finely divided state. If the heat of the flame were sufficiently intense, this carbon would first get white-hot, and then pass to the condition of an invisible vapor, and the flame would be luminous without smoke. Now alcohol burns with an intense heat and without smoke, and therefore a proper mixture of the two did give a beautiful white light. But, alas! the luxury proved too dangerous. As a friend of the undertaker, the “deadly trolley” could not begin to compete with it. We could a tale unfold of many accidents, but a single one will suffice to give an insight into the devious ways of the substance, and it is as clear to our recollection as if it happened but yesterday. A grocer, while drawing some of the “liquid gunpowder” into a measuring vessel, accidentally let a “live” cigar stump fall into the fluid. The building was insured for its full value, and the funeral was largely and respectably attended. The stuff was sold under various fancy names, but “*Burning Fluid*” was the generic term. As far as burning was concerned, it was a brilliant success, but fortunately, if it began like a meteor, it ended like a shooting star. End of the episode, the grocer, and the “fluid.”

In the meantime, crude petroleum had been tried as a medicine, and, as we have hinted, with some success; but there was hardly rheumatism enough in the country to warrant exploiting on a large scale. It had also been tried as a lubricating oil, and had given fair promise for the future. It had been tried as a lamp oil, and gave light. The wicks, however, became encrusted with coke, the flame was somewhat smoky, and the odors thereof were a long way from those of Araby the Blest. Something, however, had to be done, and so they set to work in earnest to purify the oil. Chemicals were tried first, and partial success fol-



viewed their use ; but it was only after recourse was had to distillation that the "light of the future" became the light of the present, or was at least discernible through the rifts in the coming time.

The demand for petroleum now became so eager, that men literally forgot their salt. It was then that the Pennsylvania Rock Oil Company was incorporated by George H. Bissel and Jonathan Eveleth, December 30, 1854, under the laws of the State of New York. The oil estate consisted of 105 acres of land in Venango and Crawford counties, Pa., hard by the lumbering village of Titusville, at the junction of Pine and Oil creeks, a few miles north of the point where the latter empties its greasy waters into the Allegheny river, and where Oil City now stands. This company seems to have contented itself with digging, filling out, and skimming off, but after a little over two years of this poetic work, the property was sold to Ives and Pierpont, of New Haven, and a new organization was effected under the name of the Seneca Oil Company." They, too, dragged along in the old ruts another year or more, until at last it dawned upon them that the source of the oil might be at a greater depth than could be reached by mere digging. They accordingly engaged Mr. E. L. Drake to go out to Titusville and drill an artesian well for oil. Drake arrived on the scene in the spring of 1858, and set to work. His idea at first, seems to have been, to dig down to the rock, and then drill, just as they had done for brine at Kanawha fifty years before. The quicksands and water, however, protested so vigorously that he was obliged to give up that idea. But the "mother of invention" was there, and with her counsel he procured an iron pipe and drove it straight down to the rock, which proved to be at a depth of 36 feet below the surface of the ground. The bore of the pipe was large enough to accommodate the drilling tools, such as, by anticipation, we have already described. The idea of a drive-pipe originated, indeed, with Drake, and it is only second in importance to Billy Morris's Jars. By midsummer, the whole outfit was set up, and all in readiness to begin the attack, when it was discovered that the "borers," who had been engaged early in the season, had got tired of waiting, and had secured work elsewhere. It was too late to find others, so nothing remained but to lay over till the next season, when William Smith and his two sons, experienced salt-well borers, were engaged. They arrived in June, but did not get things ready to strike the first blow till the middle of August. They began at that, and in two weeks they had penetrated the rock to a depth of 33 feet, when, just before shutting down on Saturday night, August 28, 1859, the drill struck a crevice into which it fell 6 inches. Smith was obliged to know what was going to come of it, and was so saturated with oil mania, that he made up his mind to brave the scandal and investigate the matter even on the Sabbath day. In extenuation, however, it may be stated that he waited till the afternoon. He then went and dropped a pebble into the pipe, and hearing a splash he knew that the drill-hole was full of liquid to within a few feet of the top. He established communication with that liquid by means of a tin cup on the



end of a string, and found to his joy that it was petroleum. Such is the story of Drake's well, the first well bored, *ex professo*, as we may say for petroleum. The news that oil which rose, of its own accord, to the surface, had been obtained by boring, spread like wild-fire, and land around Titusville was eagerly bought up.

The daily product of all the wells in June, 1860, was estimated at 200 barrels. By September, 1861, the daily production had reached 700 barrels, and then commenced the flowing-well period, with an addition to the production of 6000 or 7000 barrels a day. The price fell to 20 cents a barrel, then to 15, then to 10. Soon, it was impossible to obtain barrels on any terms, for all the coopers in the surrounding country could not make them as fast as the Empire well could fill them. Small producing wells were forced to cease operations, and scores of operators became disheartened and abandoned their wells. The production during the early part of 1863 was scarcely half that of the beginning of 1862, and that of 1864 was still less. In May, 1865, the production had declined to less than 4000 barrels a day. Commencing at Titusville in 1859, the tide of development swept over the valley of Oil Creek, and along the Allegheny river above and below Oil City for a considerable distance; then Cherry Run, in 1864. Then Pithole creek, Benninghoff and Pioneer run; the Woods and Stevenson farms, on Oil Creek, in like succession, in 1865 and 1866; Tidewater and Triumph Hill in 1867, and in the latter part of the same year came Shamburg. In 1868, the Pleasantville oil-field furnished the chief centre of excitement. So speaks Henry in his "History of Petroleum."

On account of the decline in the production in 1865, and at the same time the increased demand which had sprung up, higher prices obtained and the immediate result was that wells were bored from Manitoulin Island on the north to Alabama on the south, and from Missouri on the west to New York on the east. Still, out of sixteen States or Territories in which petroleum has been found, only four now yield enough to be of commercial importance. These are Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and West Virginia, and of these Pennsylvania easily takes the lead. In four, semi-solid petroleum has been found, the two of importance being California and Texas. Solid petroleum has been found in ten, but in California only does it exist in paying quantities. The development of the solid and semi-solid petroleum fields has been comparatively trifling but the number of wells drilled to obtain liquid petroleum, and the results secured, have been something enormous. This will become apparent, to some extent at least, from the following statements:

The number of wells drilled during a given time has, of course, varied greatly. In some years nearly, if not quite, 4000 wells have been put down, of which about 4 per cent have proved to be mere dry holes. It must not be imagined, however, that the *producing* wells have been increased by that number, for while wells are being drilled at one point, they are being abandoned as exhausted at others. When a "strike" has been made, oil-derricks come in like an army of occupation, and

the possession of the land. Every other interest then has to give way, and the once lovely face of nature is draped in desolation. Afterwards, when the wells have been so far exhausted as to cease to be profitable, the boring "rigs" are transported to pastures new, or are left to rot where they stand. The motley army moves on; the wave of desolation passes; husbandry resumes its sway, and nature gradually and patiently repairs the ruin her children have wrought. So it has always been, and so it will always probably be till the day when the earth has given up her last barrel of treasured oil. How near, or how far away, that day may be to mortal can tell.

The total shipment of oil in 1857 was made to a firm in Brooklyn, N. Y. It amounted to 505½ gallons of crude oil, and was valued at 70 cents a gallon; but the price soon rose to \$2.00 a gallon, and then came oil creek, and all that came in its train.

*Table Showing the Yearly Production, Average Price, and Total Value of Oil for the Years indicated.*

Year.	Number of Barrels.	Average price per barrel.	Value.
1859	2,000	\$20 00	\$40,000 00
1860	500,000	9 60	4,800,000 00
1861	2,113,609	49	1,035,668 41
1862	3,056,690	1 05	3,209,524 50
1863	2,611,309	3 15	8,225,623 35
1864	2,116,109	9 87½	20,896,576 37
1865	2,497,700	6 59	16,459,843 00
1866	3,597,700	3 74	13,455,398 00
1867	3,347,300	2 41	8,066,993 00
1868	3,646,117	3 62½	13,217,174 12
1869	4,215,000	5 63	23,730,450 00
1870	5,260,745	3 89¾	20,503,753 63
1871	5,205,341	4 34	22,591,179 94
1872	5,890,248	3 64	21,770,502 72
1873	9,890,964	1 83	18,100,464 12
1874	10,809,852	1 17	12,647,526 84
1875	8,787,506	1 35	11,863,133 10
1876	8,968,906	2 56¼	22,982,821 62
1877	13,135,771	2 42	31,788,565 82
1878	15,163,462	1 19	18,044,519 78
1879	20,041,581	85¾	17,210,707 68
1880	26,032,421	94½	24,600,637 84
Total, . . .	156,890,331	2 13½	\$334,911,063 84
1881 to 1890	392,000,000	68	266,500,000 00
1891	54,291,980	55	29,860,598 00
1892	50,509,136	51⅓	25,901,436 00
1893	48,412,666	59¾	28,932,326 00
Grand Total,	702,104,113	97¾	\$686,105,428 84

Strictly, speaking, all these figures are for Pennsylvania and the small oil field of New York lying adjacent thereto; but they may be considered sufficiently exact for our purpose, since the output of all the rest

of the country certainly does not exceed one per cent. of the whole. The numbers given for the decade 1881 to 1890, are merely estimates as the official figures were not at hand ; all the other figures are from official statistics. The values given are for the crude oil, just as it is sold in bulk ; but it is clear that oil refined for illuminating, lubricating, not to mention medicinal and other purposes, must be worth much more. Thus, a barrel of crude oil was worth in 1893, 59¾ cents, while the average cost of refined oils, of all kinds, was about \$2.10, or over three and a half times as much. If we figure on this basis, we shall find that the amount added to the wealth of the country by the development of the petroleum industry, in thirty-five years, will reach, in round numbers, the magnificent sum of two and a half billions of dollars, and this without taking account of petroleum in the solid, semi-solid, and gaseous forms. If this liquid petroleum were all stored in barrels, and the barrels placed end to end, they would make a line long enough to reach around the earth fifteen times.

Finally, we give another short table which, we doubt not, will be of interest. It is taken from Joseph D. Weeks' "Report on Petroleum," for 1893.

*The World's Production of Petroleum.*

Countries.	Production in Barrels.
United States (1893), . . . . .	48,412,666
Russia, Baku (1893), . . . . .	33,104,126
Russia, elsewhere (1890), . . . . .	251,543
Austria-Hungary (1890), . . . . .	816,000
Canada (1893), . . . . .	798,406
Peru (1890), . . . . .	350,000
India (1891), . . . . .	146,107
Germany (1892) . . . . .	103,323
France (1891), . . . . .	70,000
Japan (1890), . . . . .	48,027
Argentina (1891), . . . . .	21,000
Italy (1891), . . . . .	8,085
Great Britain (1892), . . . . .	1,526
Other countries (estimated), . . . . .	200,000
Total, . . . . .	84,330,809

From this table we learn that the United States supplies about 57½ per cent. of the world's petroleum, and Russia 39½ per cent., leaving just 3 per cent. to be accounted for by all the small fry together, of which Great Britain is the smallest, her contribution being less than one five-hundredth of one per cent.

For much of the information given in this article we acknowledge our indebtedness to S. F. Peckham's "Report on Petroleum," in the United States Tenth Census ; and also to Dr. William Brann't recent work on the same subject, which, barring the little slip mentioned above, is worthy of all commendation.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

## Book Notices.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES COMPARED IN CIVILIZATION, POPULAR HAPPINESS, GENERAL INTELLIGENCE AND MORALITY. By *Alfred Young*, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle.

"The chief object of this book," says its author, "is to examine into the truth or falsehood of the grave popular accusations laid against the Catholic Church, her priesthood and people; and also to test the value of the evidence offered in support of the boastful claims one so often hears made for the alleged superior intellectual character and moral influence of Protestantism and modern secularism."

The book is a plain, well-written, truthful statement of the question at issue. Father Young gives facts and figures. His facts are chiefly from Protestant authors, and his figures are from official statistics. The value of the book can hardly be overrated, if we bear in mind the almost total ignorance of the non-Catholic American, not only of the Catholic Church and her doctrines, but of the principles of divine revelation.

Father Young cites the Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden in the *Century Magazine* for March, 1894, who says of the ready credence given to the vile calumnies published against Catholics that "the depth and density of that popular ignorance which permits the use of such documents is certainly appalling."

If a respectable Protestant minister, thoroughly American and patriotic, is forced to cry out against the appalling "depth and density" of the ignorance of his Protestant fellow-citizens concerning us, and his on vital questions—questions that affect the honor and character and patriotism of Catholics, the case must be bad indeed.

What the Rev Dr. Gladden says to-day, Rev. Leonard Bacon, a director of "The American and Foreign Christian Union," said years ago. "The series of books issued by the Society are," he says, "infamous and scandalous rubbish." And Putnam's Magazine, in which the reverend director condemned this unchristian conduct of the said Protestant society, denounced the publications as "wicked impostures and shameful scandals." Did the writers of the Christian Union recall and destroy these infamous books, these vile impostures, these shameful scandals? Father Young tells us that instead of destroying them they denounced Dr. Bacon and demanded his expulsion from the Society.

A book that furnishes an array of facts of this sad nature—facts written and deplored by fair-minded Protestants, is surely a valuable contribution to the literature of to-day. There is no doubt that the erroneous notions of our religion entertained by non-Catholics are the direct outcome of their "appalling ignorance" of the first principles of Christianity.

It is our duty to strive to remedy this very great evil. Father Young has done much. Let all Catholics help the good work by circulating his very timely book.

"A nation," he says, "is the more civilized in which the equality of human nature is the more emphatically recognized, and in which the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty and the pursuit of true happiness are more securely defended."

The recognition of the equality of our common nature brings out the simple, sublime truth that God is the beginning and the end of all things; that He has created us; that by His overruling providence He governs the universe, and that His law is the only standard of moral excellence. The man who realizes this fact and makes the divine law his rule of life, whether he be rich or poor, has the elements of civilization in him, and a nation made up of such men would not be far from true civilization.

That civilization, on the other hand, which consists in colossal fortunes, great material progress, in extensive railroads and great waterways; which beatifies the rich man and looks upon the poor man as wretched, and his poverty, if not a crime, at least as a something so abhorrent to the sensibilities of the cultured that it must be hurried out of sight, is not true civilization.

Mere material progress effaces all noble ideals of conduct, making success the sole end of life. It either ignores God or questions His right of dominion or interference in this world, saying: "Who is the Lord that I should serve Him?"

This pagan civilization makes might right, brutalizes man and prepares him to prey upon the society that has robbed him by a false education of his real status in life.

This, Father Young shows clearly. He proves his position by setting before us the state of society to-day in England. He very properly selects England as the foremost and wealthiest of the Protestant countries. England governs or misgoverns more than one-fourth of the population of the world. Her territories are found on both continents, her ships on every sea. She is the world's great banking-house. Her missionaries, protected by her arms, are met in every land. Church and State are united. Her bishops are lords of the realm and her clergy gentlemen of the highest culture. And yet her own people, the people of England, English men and English women, are the most degraded on the face of the earth.

This is, indeed, a bold statement; but hear Father Young on the subject and examine his proofs:

"There is no nation on the face of the earth of which equal evidence could be furnished of its people's degradation, brutal slavery, appalling immorality, and unparalleled pauperism, as has been written concerning England by Englishmen themselves, to say nothing of other testimonies. Who are enlightened in England? A very few, compared with the great mass of the people. The peasantry, the laborers, the miners, the factory operatives, the millions who deserve the name of 'the people'—these are simply wretched barbarians."

Father Young cites Mr. Charles Edward Lester, a Protestant, in his "Glory and Shame of England," as follows: "The ignorance, vice, disease, deformity, and wretchedness of the English operatives as a body almost exceed belief. I am persuaded the physical miseries of the English operatives are greater by far than the *West India slaves suffered before their emancipation*. They are too ignorant to understand their rights, and too weak to assert them."

The poet Southey says: "We talk of the liberty of the English, and they talk of their own liberty; but *there is no liberty in England for the poor*. They are no longer sold with the soil it is true; but they cannot quit the soil if there be any probability or suspicion that age or infirmity may disable them. If, in such a case, they endeavor to remove to some situation where they hope more easily to maintain themselves, the overseers are alarmed; the intruder is apprehended as if he were a criminal,

and sent back to his own parish. Wherever a pauper dies, that parish must bear the cost of his funeral; instances, therefore, have not been wanting of wretches in the last stage of disease having been hurried away in an open cart upon straw, and dying upon the road. Nay, even women in the very pains of labor have been driven out, and have perished by the wayside, because the birthplace of the child would be its parish."

Is it necessary to go further?

Mr. Joseph Kay, in his startling work, "The Social Condition and Education of the English People," whose work was the result of his observations as a commissioner appointed by the University of Cambridge to examine and report on the social condition of the poor in various countries, says that nothing in all the world could be compared with the horrible condition of England. The Statistical Society of London was so astounded at the revelations of Mr. Kay, that it appointed a committee to investigate the truth of his report. This committee says: "The picture in detail of human wretchedness, filth, and brutal degradation, the chief features of which are a disgrace to a civilized country, . . . your committee finds to be too true." It goes on to say: "Out of 154 families visited, 551, containing a population of 2025 persons, have only one room each; 562 families, containing a population of 2554 persons, have only two rooms each." These conditions of life are not to be found in any other country.

Mr. Chamberlain, M. P., writes in the *Fortnightly Review*: "Never before in our history were wealth and the evidences of wealth more abundant; never before was luxurious living so general and so wanton in its display, and never before was the misery of the poor more intense, or the condition of their daily life more hopeless or more degraded. We have a million of paupers, and millions more on the verge of pauperism."

Mr. Conybeare, speaking of infidelity, says: "It is a melancholy fact that the men who make our steam engines and railway carriages, our presses and telegraphs, the furniture of our houses, and the clothing of our persons, have now, in a fearful proportion, renounced all faith in Christianity."

Can we speak of what John Ruskin, in his "Fors Clavigera," calls Hell pits, where little boys and girls not only worked like brutes, but were beaten with horrible cruelty as they crawled on their hands and knees harnessed to coal carts?"

But it is scarcely possible to write more. The condition of these poor people is too horrible and harrowing to describe. And this in Christian England! And this state of affairs is known to the Christian men and Christian women who send missionaries to convert the far off heathen! The Queen, the Lords, and the Commons, the Commissions and the Committees, are all aware of it, and what is done to effect a remedy? We say with regret, scarcely anything.

Hear the Protestant Bishop of Rochester: "I lament that dense, and coarse, and almost brutal ignorance, in which the toiling masses of the people who have outgrown the Church's grasp, are permitted to live and die, of all that touches their salvation, and explains their destiny." To what must we attribute this gloomy and terrible condition of the English masses? To the utter failure of Protestantism, and to that heartless indifference which is its logical outcome.

Contrast England with Spain. Spain, one of the poorest countries in Europe. The peasantry are gentle in their manners, moral in their relations, free from that coarseness and brutality that is so painfully evidenced in our picture of the English.

Hear Mr. Thieblin: "In the lowest classes you see almost the same merits as you meet with in the highest circles. The wife of a peasant is just as loving to her husband, just as careful about her children, and just as kind to everybody surrounding her as the wife of a grandee. She is, perhaps, even more so. Whether you knock at the door of an inn or of an isolated farm, all the women of the house come to receive you, and nothing will be refused you. If you fall ill, whether it be at a hotel, a lodging-house, or the residence of a friend, you may be perfectly sure of having such kindness and attention as you could scarcely find in your own home." ("Spain and the Spaniards," by Thieblin.)

We could go on multiplying quotations in commendation of the simple and happy lives of the peasantry of Spain. No coarseness, no brutality, no startling immorality; but a people who, though not wealthy, realize that they are the children of God, and endeavor to lead lives worthy of their sublime destiny.

We have reviewed but two chapters of this admirable work. It would require a lengthy article to do anything like justice to its merits, or to convey anything like an adequate idea of the unquestionable testimonies of the superiority of Catholic countries to Protestant countries in gentleness of manners, in social happiness, and in the morality of the poor.

BROTHER JUSTIN.

---

PATROLOGIA SYRIACA. accurate R. Graffin. Pars Prima, ab initiis usque ad annum 350. Tomus primus. Parisiis: Firmin-Didot et Socii.

It is the peculiarity of Syriac literature to be almost exclusively sacred, so that the term *Patrologia Syriaca* is nearly synonymous with Syriac literary activity. This language also possesses the perennial charm of being the native tongue of Our Blessed Lord and of His Immaculate Mother, as preserving the identical terms in which Gabriel saluted Mary, St. Peter, the Son of the Living God, and Christ His chosen Vicar. It was, moreover, chiefly among the Syrians that the storms raised by Nestorius and Eutyches exercised their most pernicious influence. No Catholic theologian, therefore, can afford to ignore this department of sacred learning. The rudiments of the Syriac, the easiest of the Oriental languages, ought to be imparted in all our theological seminaries; and even those who cannot follow the original text can derive profit from reading the careful Latin translations which usually accompany it.

We take great pleasure, therefore, in introducing to our readers the new edition of the Syriac fathers which is now begun by the famous publishing house of Firmin-Didot, under the competent direction of Graffin, Professor of Syriac in the Catholic University of Paris. Like all the works issuing from the press of Firmin-Didot, the volume before is a perfect model of the typographer's art.

The first tome contains the first twenty-two *Demonstrationes* of Aphraates, the most ancient Syrian father whose works have come down to us. The twenty-third, *Demonstratio De Acino*, being written at a later period, is not included with the others. This to us, at first sight, seems to be a mistake. The task of editing this author was committed to Father Pavisot, O S.B., who has prefixed a valuable preliminary treatise.

Mention was made of these *Demonstrationes* in the fifth century by Gennadius, who, however, ascribes them to James of Nisibis, the firm assertor of orthodoxy in the age of the Nicene Council. The misunderstanding arose from the fact that Aphraates, either at his conversion or on being elevated to the episcopate, took the name of Jacob, and was commonly known by the appellation of Mar Jacob. Fourteen of these dissertations were given to the world by Cardinal Antonelli in 1756, in a Latin translation from an Armenian version found in Venice. It



was not until the present century that the original Syriac text was discovered among the Nitrian codices of the British Museum; and finally, in 1869, the learned Wm. Wright published it under the title, "*The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, edited from Syriac manuscripts of the fifth and sixth century in the British Museum.*" Thus the most ancient of the Syrian doctors was reintroduced to the learned world.

From (sometimes slender) indications we gather that Aphraates was born of heathen parents somewhere in the Persian Empire; that he lived during the reign of Sapor; that, before his episcopate, he was a monk of the monastery of St. Matthew; that the period of his literary activity extended from 336 to 345. He was, therefore, somewhat younger than St. James of Nisibis, and older than St. Ephraem. The dissertations which he has left us have been variously styled "*Homilies*," "*Letters*," "*Chapters*," "*Memoirs*," "*Histories*," etc. The first twenty-two are arranged and named after the letters of the Syriac alphabet; the twenty-third is of the nature of a chronicle. The main purpose of the author seems to be to assert the divinity of the Christian religion, chiefly against the Jews; but he intermingles so much varied moral, historical, and dogmatic information, that he becomes a witness to the faith of the Church in Nicene times that cannot be too highly prized.

It is remarkable that Aphraates, living as he did at a time when Arianism was rampant and, at times, almost triumphant, does not make a single mention either of the heresy or the tumults it caused. This shows how feeble an echo the great contention raised across the Euphrates. The persecuting spirit of Sapor is his chief concern, and the heresies which he sets about confuting are Gnosticism and that monstrosity to which Persia gave birth—Manicheism.

As to the doctrines which he holds, the following points are worthy of notice, as showing his genuine Catholic spirit. He has in supreme veneration the Sacred Scriptures, as inspired by God and dictated by the Holy Ghost. He holds those books for sacred "which are recited in the Church of God." It is to be regretted that he has nowhere had occasion to give the list of the Sacred Books; but so deeply is he versed in the word of God that he has incidentally quoted from nearly all of them. His citations agree, in the main, with the Peshitta Version, but with variations which induce the editor to believe that he quoted from an older recension than that which is now in use, and that our Syriac Bible might be in places revised according to the text of Aphraates. As to the interpretation of Scripture, the "*Persian Sage*" is a firm believer in the doctrine of more than one meaning, and he compares the Sacred Text to a precious gem which can be appreciated properly only when viewed from all sides. He insists, however, that the Scriptures are not open to the arbitrary interpretations of each individual, but that, "even as the coin of the realm must bear the effigy of the king," so must the genuine sense be sought in the writings and traditions of the ancients. Time and again he asserts the authority of the Church and of tradition in the interpretation of Holy Writ and the establishing of true doctrine.

The teachings of this ancient and far-away writer on the great Christian tenets are thoroughly Catholic and orthodox. Not only does he give an accurate exposition of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, but, moreover, of the efficacy and necessity of grace; of original sin and the hereditary curse contracted from Adam and removed by Baptism. He has a Syrian's love for Mary, lauds her virginity, her divine motherhood, and her exelling virtues. He knows that the Church has been



founded upon the Rock, and proclaims St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles.

He is equally orthodox respecting the Sacraments. Baptism is the "true circumcision," the "sign of life"; by it "sins are washed away." It is to be conferred by an express invocation of the Three Divine Persons.

He confesses the Eucharist to be the Body and Blood of Christ, Who at the last supper gave to the Apostles His own Body and Blood. The Eucharist, he teaches, is the sacrifice foretold by Malachias.

Not less clearly does he insist on Penance and the Confession of Sins, to which subject he devotes the whole of Demonstration VII. It is the office, he tells us, of the physicians of the soul, the priests, to heal the wounds of him who has been injured in the battle of life, provided the wounded man expose his wound and cry "Peccavi." Let the sinner not shrink from confessing his sins and imploring penance. The spiritual physician should admonish and give healing remedies; on no account should he divulge the fault revealed.

He likewise refers more or less openly to all the other sacraments, except matrimony, which did not happen to come within his range of view.

Every one can see how valuable, from a controversial point of view, are the testimonies to Catholic truth, scattered through the interesting pages of this out-of-the-way "Persian Sage."

One peculiar notion, which Aphraates certainly did not draw from the doctrine of the Church, would have involved him in a sea of trouble, had he lived in the stormy days of John XXII. He held that the souls of the deceased are somehow tied up in a comatose condition with their bodies, and will not be relieved from this embarrassing situation until the day of judgment.

It was, to be sure, an extremely odd notion, which shows how poorly developed were the metaphysical powers of the writer; but there is all the difference in the world between a crude error and a formal heresy. To a man of Aphraates' humility and devotion to the Church, heresy would have been impossible, and it is safe to say that, were he now living, he would join with us in wondering how any one could have fallen into this grotesque error.

We are thankful, therefore, to the Catholic University of Paris for this great undertaking, to the editor for the ability with which he has addressed himself to the work, and to the distinguished publishers for the magnificence with which they have clothed it.

---

JOHN BAPTIST FRANZELIN, S.J., Cardinal Priest of the Title SS. Boniface and Alexander. By the *Rev. Nicholas Walsh, S.J.* M. H. Gill & Son: Dublin. 1895.

This neat volume is dedicated to the English-speaking novices and scholastics of the Society of Jesus, and to the English-speaking scholars of Cardinal Franzelin. The author has kept this two fold object before him throughout his work, first, of holding up the great cardinal as a model of humble sanctity and boundless erudition combined, and secondly, of adding pleasant reminiscences of the days when he sat at the feet of his venerated teacher. The first object he has sought to obtain by inserting at intervals little sermons on various topics suggested by the life which he is reviewing; and although the author seeks to disarm criticism by pleading inexperience, we are compelled to say that the pure, unvarnished tale of the saintly Franzelin's life is a better incentive to novices to join study with prayer than these perpetual and somewhat vexatious

interruptions. The novices will, of course, be forced to make the best of it, as the book will be adopted, and rightly, for their spiritual reading. Others will skip page after page.

Nevertheless, there are pages enough, outside the sermons, to make it a charming little work. The author's enthusiasm for the great man with whom it was his good fortune to be in close contact, is really contagious, and many a priest whose acquaintance with the first Jesuit theologian of the age has been confined to the printed volumes of his grand and exhaustive treatises will be extremely grateful to Father Walsh for the insight now afforded them into his daily life.

Franzelin was born of poor but deeply religious parents at a village near Trent in sturdy Catholic Tyrol on the 13th of April, 1816. His early education was under the direction of the Franciscan fathers in the neighboring town of Bolzano. From the first, the youth was distinguished as well for profound piety as for his intellectual gifts. He became a thorough master of the classical and biblical languages, and to the latest day the Hebrew Bible was his constant and favorite companion. In his eighteenth year he entered the novitiate of the Jesuits at Gratz in Styria, and "outshone all by his rare example." His unintermitting studies and severe austerities undermined his delicate constitution and brought on obstinate chest-troubles and blood-spitting with which he was ever afterward troubled. Having completed his novitiate, he was employed for six years in Galicia teaching languages; after which, his superiors sent him to the Roman College, the great Jesuit institution in which Bellarmine, Suarez, Lugo, Maldonatus, Vasquez, and a host of other illustrious professors had conferred unparalleled glory. Here Franzelin had not yet finished his theological studies under the direction of Perrone and Passaglia, when the troubles of 1848 dissolved the Society so that, with Passaglia and others, he took refuge for a time in England. In 1850, Franzelin, now ordained, returned to Rome and was placed upon the staff of teachers in the Roman College. In 1857 he was named to succeed Father Perrone in the Chair of Dogmatic Theology in the college, a position which he held for nineteen years. It was during this period that he delivered those immortal lectures which, afterwards published in book form, have become the valued possession of the entire Church, and are nowise inferior to the best productions of the greatest theologians of former days. He seemed to be not only the Scriptures and the Fathers but the Scholastics also at his fingers' ends. No one has ever surpassed him in ability of marshalling his vast erudition, in acuteness of analysis, or clearness of exposition. After finishing any of his great theological treatises, one feels that there remains little or nothing to be learned elsewhere upon the subject. Another characteristic of his writings, and it was still more characteristic of his spoken word, is the intenseness of religious feeling which permeates them. "At times," says his biographer, "when lecturing on the Eucharist, its effects in the souls of men, the teaching of the Church on devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Conception, the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the tender piety of his heart flashed out despite himself and touched others. I say despite himself for in the chair he was a theologian and nothing else, nor did he go out of his way to introduce mere spiritual or pious allusions. It was again and again remarked by his scholars, that he not only satisfied their intellects, but often moved their hearts."<sup>1</sup> It is this peculiar uncertainty of Cardinal Franzelin's works, as likewise of Cardinal Newman's,

<sup>1</sup> p. 109.

which makes them the best possible models, when popularized, of pulpit oratory. Our age demands this intimate fusion of solid dogmatic truth with genuine unaffected piety.

It was only very gradually and reluctantly that Father Franzelin from a professor became an author. For the convenience of his scholars he began to lithograph his lectures. In 1868 was published the first of his great treatises, "Divine Tradition and Scripture," which, in the estimation of many, is the most perfect and valuable of all his works. Then slowly followed volume after volume until his death, each treatise being eagerly and thankfully greeted by the whole learned Catholic world.

Father Walsh does not expend much space upon the literary labors of Franzelin, taking for granted that all are familiar with his books, and preferring to follow his hero into the quiet routine of his daily life. Indeed, we cannot wonder that the spectacle of such profound humility in the midst of such great intellectual gifts should have made a lasting impression upon those who were brought into contact with it. It was not surprising that Pius IX. should have wished to raise the illustrious theologian to the dignity of the cardinalate; but it was truly edifying to behold the great man when, unable to shirk the undesired promotion, finding some relief in an agony of tears. It was also a continual object lesson in humility and piety to observe how little the new dignity changed the character and manners of the good religious. "The only signs of his dignity," says one who visited him, "were the red berretto or skull-cap, which is *de rigueur*, and a very poor-looking ring. He had two rather small rooms, in one of which he studied, took his meals and slept; and into the other he went only to receive visitors. He got rid of carpets which had been laid down, but allowed them to be replaced by some cheap, rough matting. Through the whole year, winter and summer, he rose at 4 o'clock; at 5.30, immediately after his meditation, he went to his confessor, and for the last two years of his life he did so every morning; nor would he ever allow, though pressed to do so, his confessor to come to him, nor go to confession before others, even the youngest student, if he found him on the corridor awaiting his turn." Certainly, this spectacle of a prince of Holy Church awaiting his turn among students to make his daily confession, would be an admirable subject for the pencil, and is more impressive than a score of sermons. Thus did Cardinal Franzelin pass the eleven closing years of his life, during which he was engaged upon the most important and difficult matters of ecclesiastical administration. The end came placidly on the early morning of December 11, 1886.

Franzelin's was a life full worthy of being put on record, and the task has fallen to one who was well equipped with an intimate knowledge of his subject and that first requisite in a biographer, an intense personal admiration for a great and holy man.

---

LUDOVICI DE SAN, S.J., in Collegio maximo Lovaniensi, S.J., Professoris, Academice Romanæ S. Thomæ Aq. Socii, Tractatus de Deo Uno. Pars Prior præter tractatus partes prioris ipsius tractatus continens disquisitionem de mente Sancti Thomæ circa Prædeterminationes Physicas. Lovanii excedebat Carolus Peeters, 1885. From Benziger Brothers: 36-38 Barclay St., New York.

We had hoped before noticing this volume to have read it with some thought of the care and attention its importance demands, but regret that so far, we have been unable to secure the requisite leisure. We have, however, examined it sufficiently to be able to testify to its great value and clearness. A volume, indeed, of 778 pages, large octavo, devoted

a portion of a simple tract (on the Being and Attributes of God) is itself sufficient to indicate the thoroughness which characterizes the work. This fullness of treatment without prolixity makes it comparatively easy reading, and gives a clearness and intelligibility that can hardly be hoped for in any mere compendium.

What will particularly interest most readers will undoubtedly be the "disquisition" on the teaching and "mind" of St. Thomas "circa predeterminationes physicas," that is, on the question whether in all those acts which the divine goodness and assistance enables man to perform in the work of his salvation, the human will is not only aided but predetermined by divine grace. The Catholic Church, as is well known, maintains the necessity of divine grace to enable a man to believe, hope, love or repent as he ought; it teaches, in short, that no one can elicit any act or do anything whatever in the order of salvation without the prompting and assistance of the Divine Spirit, but it no less strongly affirms man's responsibility and freedom in accepting and acting under its gracious influence. "If any one saith, that man's free will moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates towards disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification; that it cannot refuse its consent, if it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever and is merely passive; let him be anathema."—Council of Trent, Sess. VI., Can. 4. Accordingly, Catholic theologians of all schools in opposition to Calvin and his followers, hold, and are bound to hold, that the human will remains free even under the influence of what is called efficacious grace; that is, of all grace which a man accepts and co-operates with, or which, in fact, produces the effect for which it was given. A certain school, however, which claims to be specially Thomistic, agrees with Calvin in asserting that efficacious grace is such intrinsically and of its own nature predetermined the human will, but differs from him by denying that it follows from this that the will does not remain free. Catholic theologians of other schools find fault, not so much with Calvin's logic as with his premise; they maintain that efficacious grace aids indeed and strengthens the will but does not predetermine it, and compare such grace rather to a most powerful and efficacious medicine, which will infallibly produce its effect if accepted and used by the patient, but otherwise not. In the modern use of the term (efficacious grace) this acceptance and consent on the part of the will is presupposed; that is, a grace is not said to be efficacious unless actually accepted and fruitful; thus the will is, indeed, already determined, but determined, it is concluded, by its own free act, prompted and aided by grace, and not by grace alone.

For their peculiar views, the predeterminationists claim especially the authority of St. Thomas; in a similar manner Calvinists have always claimed the authority of St. Augustine. There are, no doubt, in both St. Thomas and St. Augustine phrases and passages that would seem to justify the respective claims; but it is a question of interpretation or exegesis; and just as Holy Scripture admits sometimes of different and even contradictory interpretations, so do the writings of the Fathers and scholastics. What has ever appeared more clearly and thoroughly Calvinistic, at least to Calvinists, than that passage of St. Augustine where he says: "Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humane, divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur." "There-

<sup>1</sup> We take *insuperabiliter*, not *inseparabiliter*, to be undoubtedly the correct reading.

fore aid was brought<sup>1</sup> to the infirmity of human will, so that it might be unchangeably and invincibly influenced by divine grace."—Dr. Wallis Edinburgh translation. The word "*ageretur*," here translated influenced, has, we think, been generally understood by Protestants to mean "acted upon"; but "*agi*," in such a connection, does not mean "to be acted upon" or "influenced," but "to be moved to action," "*be led*," "to march," "to go" (for proofs, see, for example, Harper's "Dictionary," under "*ago*."—B.), and the meaning of the passage quoted is that "the weakness of the human will has been aided, so as to be led unflinchingly<sup>2</sup> and insuperably by divine grace." The point inculcated is, not that grace is invincible against the human will, but that the human will, led and strengthened by grace, is invincible against temptation. This, besides being clear in itself, is borne out by the "*subventum est*," "*aided*," and by the rest of the sentence: "*et ideo quamvis infirma, non tamen deficeret, neque adversitate aliqua vinceretur*"; "and therefore, although weak, yet it should not fail nor be overcome by any opposition."

We have given this as a specimen to show how easy it is for even learned and able men to mistake and consequently to misrepresent the meaning and drift of an author, unless they are thoroughly acquainted with and pay strict attention to the exact force of the language he uses. St. Augustine clearly has been much misunderstood by those who claim, no doubt sincerely, to be his special disciples, and so, we believe, has St. Thomas. Were it otherwise, and were the Calvinistic interpretation of St. Augustine and the predeterminationist representation of St. Thomas in reality correct, we should have to say of these great saints and profound thinkers, "*humani aliquid passi sunt*." But, happily, we have no need of recurring to such an hypothesis; a true understanding of these saints' real teaching, we are persuaded, no less than a regard for their honor, forbid us to entertain it. For the proof of this as regards St. Thomas, and for a thorough examination and exposition of his "mind" and writings on the subject, we take pleasure in referring our readers to Fr. De San's able "*Disquisition*," which occupies more than 200 pages of the volume before us.

The price is \$3.10 net, but Messrs. Benziger request us to state that the second volume (which will complete the work) will be furnished gratuitously to purchasers of the first.

---

THINGS OF THE MIND. By J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1894.

Bishop Spalding's latest book appears with this very general title, which does not tell us much of its contents. We open the volume and find that it contains seven chapters, with these headings: 1. Views of Education; 2. Views of Education; 3. Views of Education; 4. Professional Education; 5. Theories of Life and Education; 6. Culture and Religion; 7. Patriotism. These titles are also very general, particularly the first four, and we turn over a page to read the preface, in which, no doubt, the author will tell us something about the history of the book: when he wrote it, or its different chapters; what particular occasions called them forth; the connection of one chapter with another and why they now appear together. Then we shall read the introduction, in which the author will tell us how he is going to treat this subject

<sup>1</sup> "*Is brought*," Amer. ed.

<sup>2</sup> "*Indeclinabiliter*" means "unflinchingly" rather than "unchangeably."

d by placing before us an outline of the whole work, he will enable us to understand the meaning of each part.

But there is no preface or introduction. We are sorry, because these few preliminary pages excite our interest at once by introducing us to the author, and by bringing us into sympathy with his methods and purposes.

We turn now to the matter of the chapters. The book is not a connected treatise on education, nor on any particular part of it, but it is made up of essays or addresses written apparently at different times and for different occasions. We do not know the times or the occasions which gave rise to them, except in two instances. The chapter entitled, "Professional Education" contains an address made to a graduating class of some medical school in Kentucky, and the chapter on "Theories of Life and Education" reproduces a paper with the same title which appeared in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* of January, 1879.

Most of these essays will hardly interest the general reader. They are made up for the most part of epigrammatic sentences and quotations from the Greek, the Latin and the English classics, which follow one another very rapidly. The general reader does not jump to conclusions, he creeps to them, nor is he willing to be carried to them instead of being led. It is evident that the cultured author has written only for the *litterati*, a class which (we say it with unfeigned regret) is growing more and more scarce in this busy age and country, where very few have the leisure to acquire taste of appreciating pure literature for its own sweet sake. The majority of us demand books that are brimful of facts and practical ideas. But there is room and a public for all sorts of books and styles.

*CHANTAL AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE VISITATION.* By *Monseigneur Bougard*, Bishop of Laval. Translated from the eleventh French edition by a Visitandine. 2 vols., 8vo. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1895.

The first edition of this work was published in 1861; the second, revised by the gifted author, appeared two years later; and the translation before us is made from the eleventh. This is a great book. It is the life of a great saint, made by a great biographer, from exceptionally good documents.

Jeanne-Françoise Frémyot was born at Dijon, the capital of Burgundy, and the native place of St. Bernard and Bossuet, in the year 1572. Her mother died when she was eighteen months old. At the age of twenty she married Baron de Chantal, and after eight years of happy married life, during which she bore six children, she was left a widow by the sudden death of her husband. She immediately made a vow of chastity and began to devote herself to works of piety and charity. After much trouble of conscience in choosing a director, in 1604 she met St. Francis de Sales and placed herself under his guidance. The description of their first meeting and the record of their communications for eighteen years until he died in 1622, charms the reader, and surrounds him with the odor of sanctity in which these two holy souls dwelt.

After the death of St. Francis, St. Vincent de Paul became her director and guide for twenty years, until she died in 1641. She was canonized in 1751. For eighteen years this saint was directed by St. Francis de Sales, and for twenty years St. Vincent de Paul was her spiritual father. The first said of her: "I have found in Dijon, what Solomon could

not find in Jerusalem, the *strong woman*, in Madame de Chantal." St. Vincent de Paul surpassed the holy Bishop of Geneva in his praises of her. If his moderation were not so well known, he might be accused of exaggeration when he says that during the twenty years she was under his spiritual direction, he never observed in her the least imperfection. His judgment of her was confirmed immediately after her death, when in a vision he saw her soul joined to that of St. Francis de Sales, and both united to God.

The learned and pious Bishop Dupanloup said of her when reviewing this biography in 1863 :

"Here is a saint who lived almost in our own day, . . . and yet where can we find, even in the flush of the Middle Ages, even in the earliest centuries, distinction more elevated, dignity better sustained, heroism more pathetic ?

"As a child, she was pious, modest, innocent. Her energetic and Christian sentiments find a parallel only in the lives of the greatest saints.

"In early womanhood, her courage increased with the duties devolving on her. She was, in turn, a wife, a mother, the mistress of a household, a woman of the world, though never ceasing to be a saint. Whether amid the delight and splendor of a brilliant position, or struggling against the cruel trials of life, from which neither titles nor worldly affluence can shield, she displayed all that magnanimity of soul of which a Christian woman is capable. Widowed by a sudden and sorrowful accident ; living in retirement with her four little ones, whom she reared with the poor whom she loved, we behold her advancing to the highest perfection, courageously rising under the greatest saint of her age, to heroism and sacrifice unsurpassed.

"Lastly, a religious and the foundress of an order, she united to a life the most recollected, to a life wholly contemplative, the most solid and fruitful activity. She founded eighty houses of the Visitation, reformed a number of abbeys and monasteries, filled the world with her letters, her works, and the perfume of her virtues—and all this without for one moment losing sight of her children whom she directed, and whom with incomparable affection, she incited to the fulfillment of their duties, both before and after marriage."

Bishop Dupanloup read this life twice—the second time, as he says of himself, "with pencil in hand." After speaking of all the requisites for a good biography of a saint, and necessary qualifications for a good biographer ; and after mentioning all the great biographies that had come under his attention, he writes to the author of this work :

"Your St. Chantal, my dear friend, is destined to rank among the finest of these books. If the end of your labor has been the glory of God, the honor of Holy Church, the advantage to be derived by those to whom you familiarize so great a soul as the foundress of the Visitation, you may entertain the sweet hope that you have attained the end in view."

The translation is so well done that it preserves completely the beauty of the original. The spirit of the author breathes in the translator. Indeed, this book is worthy of a place on the same shelf with those other great biographies of the nineteenth century, M. l'Abbé Boucher's St. Theresa, M. de Montalembert's St. Elizabeth of Hungary, Père Lacordaire's St. Dominic, M. Chavin's St. Francis of Assisi, and the life of St. Francis de Sales by M. le Curé of St. Sulpice, Rev. M. Hamon.

J. P. T.



STITUTIONES PHILOSOPHICÆ. Ad normam doctrinæ Aristotelis et St. Thomæ Aquinatis studiosæ juventuti breviter propositæ a *Pio de Mandato*, Soc. Jesu, in Pont. Univ. Gregoriana Philosophiæ Professore. Volumen unicum. Romæ: Typographia Polyglotta. S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1894

THE many friends and admirers of Father de Mandato in the United States will learn with pleasure that he has given to the public in one volume a complete course in rational philosophy, beginning with logic and closing with natural theology, treating exhaustively ontology, cosmology and psychology.

Father de Mandato has for many years been professor of Philosophy at the Gregorian University at Rome, and this publication comes after long experience which has taught him precisely what was needed in the way of a work on philosophy which might serve at once as a guide to both professor and student. He has treated his subject-matter with brevity and completeness. His theses are thoroughly examined and discussed, opposing opinions are studied, difficulties are explained and answered, the errors of modern philosophy—especially atomism and evolutionism—are confuted, and the immortal principles of Aristotle and St. Thomas are strictly adhered to, and their adaptability to the scientific progress made since their times is clearly vindicated. The brevity of the work does not in the least affect its clearness. The theses and questions, the difficulties and solutions are all arranged in such logical order that, while space has been saved, greater lucidity has resulted than is to be found in many a more voluminous work in which stronger effort has been made to explain everything down to the smallest detail.

Father de Mandato's work is truly philosophic both in matter and method. His care has been principally given to a clear and thorough exposition of the great fundamental principles and truths with which, if the student be once thoroughly imbued, he is always ready to follow out and explain their ramifications and consequences without taxing his memory with details and without possibility of error so long as he proceeds faithfully in the light of these truths. In every question the author rises to the loftiest considerations. Indeed, it is for the most part his practice to begin with the highest notions and, descending to particulars, to show how naturally and profoundly the general truth flows through and animates all the subordinates. Thus, for example, from the well-exposed concepts of actuality and potentiality he develops easily the complete theory with regard to the reception of formalities whether substantial or accidental in their subjects, the theory of individuation of natures, the demonstration of the unity of form in all bodies which are truly individual, and especially in all living bodies. Likewise, in his treatment of the intellect and of intellectual operations, Father de Mandato is particularly fortunate in making the obtruse notions which, of necessity, enter into this matter intelligible, and has admirably traced the acquisition of our knowledge from its exterior causality to its interior perfection in the concepts of the spiritual intellect. He exhibits with scientific accuracy the intimate co-operation of the senses in the process of intellection and shows to a nicety just where the operation leaves the realm of materiality and becomes purely spiritual. The chasm between the material and the spiritual, which in the phenomenon of intellection is so evidently crossed, he bridges over by adhering strictly to the Aristotelian and Thomistic theory founded on the analogy so reasonably presumed between the working of the intellect and the material apprehensive faculties. The more accurate details which have been furnished us by the advance of scientific investigation with regard to the operation of the senses in the acquiring of knowledge



serve, in the hands of Father de Mandato, to confirm the teachings of the best scholastics concerning the origin of our ideas. The treatise on natural theology is not the least important part of the entire work. In it the learned professor has shown how conclusively a course of true philosophy founded on indisputable principles and developed under the guidance of a logical, unprejudiced, healthy reasoning, leads to the necessity of admitting the existence of one supreme, intelligent being, the Creator of all that exists outside his own essence, Himself uncreated, uncaused and, to a knowledge, imperfect, it is true, but still ennobling, of many of the attributes of this perfect being.

Father de Mandato's work has already been adopted as a text-book in many European seminaries and institutes of learning, and its first edition is nearly exhausted. There is little doubt that the second edition will scarcely suffice to satisfy the demands which will be made from the United States. As a text-book none better could be selected. It stands, as it were, midway between the student and the professor, and supplies precisely what is needed for the one and for the other. The volume may be procured at the price of \$2.00 from Benziger Brothers, New York, Chicago and Cincinnati, or from the Deposito di Libri, 12 Via del Seminario, Rome, Italy.

F. Z. R.

---

ST. PAUL AND HIS MISSIONS. BY the Abbe *Constant Fouard*. Translated with the author's sanction and co-operation by *Rev. George F. X. Griffith*. Small 8vo. pp. 432. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is the third work from the pen of the able professor of theology at Rouen on the history of early Christianity. The series was begun with "The Christ the Son of God" in two volumes, which contains the history of the founder of Christianity. Then followed a volume entitled "Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity," which tells the story of the Church from the year 30 until the year 45; and now we have this volume on "Saint Paul and his Missions," which brings the history down to the year 62. At least one more volume is to come to complete the series. The books do really form a series, and the reader of one should have the others at hand, because the references are frequent.

The title of the present volume is slightly misleading, for it does not contain anything about St. Paul's birth, his early training, his life at Jerusalem, his conversion on the road to Damascus, and his labors in that city and in Tarsus. All this has been told in the preceding book on St. Peter, and this history begins with the choosing of Saul and Barnabas by the Holy Ghost for missionary work and their departure for Cyprus. We think that the account of St. Paul's early life in the history of St. Peter should have been very brief, and that it should have been given in detail in the present volume with reference from that book to this, rather than from this to that.

We are afraid that many readers will be very much disappointed when they reach the end of this history, to find that the great apostle is only entering Rome, and that all the interesting questions about the length of his stay there, the epistles that he wrote thence, his trial and acquittal, his fourth missionary journey, and his return and death, must remain unanswered until some future time, in some other book. We like the history of a man to begin with his birth and end with his death. A hundred volumes may be required to tell the story, provided we are informed of this fact before we procure the first volume; but we do not like to be told in the first chapter of the first volume that we must go

back to some other book for the story of his birth, nor to be informed in the last chapter of the last volume that we must look forward to some other book for the story of his death. And now we have done with our fruitless finding.

The book, with the limitations we have mentioned, is admirable, admirable! Excepting Our Blessed Saviour, there is no one in all history whose life is so full of facts worthy of record as is the life of the great apostle of the Gentiles. Whether we consider it from the supposed year of his conversion in 36, until the supposed year of his death in 68; or give our attention only to his three missionary journeys and his voyage to Rome, occupying the years, probably, between 45 and 62, we have a record of travel and adventure equalled only in the imagination of the novelist. This story the Abbe Fouard tells with fullness, faithfulness, and power, following the hero through Palestine to Cyprus, through Asia Minor into Europe, and presenting with true artistic instinct the stirring scenes at Antioch of Pisidia, at Lystra, at Phillipi, at Thessalonica, at Corinth, at Athens, at Ephesus, and at Jerusalem. Any one of these missionary journeys would furnish abundant material for the most interesting story, and the most exciting drama; but the combination of them, so skillfully done, makes a book which fascinates the reader, and carries him to the end without pause. This book is worthy of attention, also, because it is the best life of St. Paul in English by a Catholic writer. We have had excellent lives of him before from the pens of Protestant writers, notably of Conybeare and Howson, to which Abbe Fouard frequently refers, and which we think is the best of all; but there has been no extensive life by a Catholic. This was very much needed, as one may easily understand by reading in the present volume the chapter on "Daily Life and Worship in the Primitive Churches," in which we catch a glimpse of the ancient belief in the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist.

The references to authorities are very frequent and satisfactory, the chronological table is carefully made, the index is full and accurate, and the two maps on which the journeys of St. Paul are marked, are unusually good.

So well has the translator done his work, that he might claim to be the author.

Altogether, we can most truthfully say, here is a great work well done.

J. P. T.

**LIFE'S DECISION.** By *T. W. Allies*. Second edition. London: Burns & Oates, New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is, one of the most interesting books of its kind that we have ever read. Indeed, we think that it ranks second only to Cardinal Newman's "Apologia." Mr. Allies belonged to that interesting group of able thinkers and writers that played so important a part in the history of the Anglican Church during the forties, when the famous Tractarian movement shook it to its foundations, and drew from it some of its strongest supports. In that movement no one was more active than the author of this book, in which he tells of his progress through the various stages of study and controversy which finally brought him into the Catholic Church. In a former work entitled "Per Crucem ad Lucem," he put forward the reasons for this action in an abstract way; in the present instance he treats of them in a personal manner. Such treatment is by far more interesting, because the application of the principles

involved, to individuals, and the results of such application shown in their actions, convince us of their soundness more quickly and more firmly than does any amount of abstract reasoning. Indeed, the application of the principle in practice is the concrete proof of its abstract soundness.

The author tells us that his object in this book is "to trace the joint operation of grace and free-will, or the mode pursued by God from 1837 to 1850 in leading me out of heresy into the Church." During this period the author kept a diary in which he recorded the various stages of the conflict, and from these notes, he composed the present work in 1850, after he had entered the Catholic Church. In 1853 he laid the manuscript away in a drawer for the future instruction of his children, then in infancy. It lay in that drawer hidden and forgotten for twenty-five years, when it was seen by one of those children for whose sake it had been composed, and he, in 1880, persuaded his father to publish it.

Besides the various discussions of doctrines and practices, and the comparison of the Catholic and the Anglican churches in regard to their teachings on them, the book contains many interesting letters from such notable persons as Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Coleridge, Bishop Wilberforce and others. It also tells of many interviews with distinguished persons, and records some very interesting estimates of character.

He describes a visit to Keble's house at Hunsley, and at the close of his stay draws this picture of him: "Confessor or martyr he was not made to be, but an ecclesiastical Walton, fishing by the side of quiet streams, and enjoying the lights and shadows as he dangled his trout at the end of his rod; no Athanasius as I had dreamed, but an Anglican parson." Here is a glimpse of another moving spirit of the times. "Marriott kicks and struggles against the effect of what he saw with me had their influence. I used to put questions to him just as they occurred to me, and he would answer in a pet, 'I cannot reply to such questions as that while I am putting on my gloves.' Poor soul! It was his first principle, that Pusey and Anglicanism *must* be right, and the more awkward the facts he had to deal with, the more he was troubled and put out."

In speaking of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Allies says: "Called on Pusey last Tuesday, and again yesterday, to set before him my difficulties. . . . We conversed about an hour and a half on these." After speaking of the answers which he received from the famous Anglican, he concludes: "This may be considered a perfect specimen of Dr. Pusey's answer to theological difficulties. Is it any wonder that as soon as one was out of his presence all the doubts came back?" What a contrast between this description and that which he gives of Newman soon after his conversion. Speaking of a visit which he made to him at Littlemore, and of the conversation which they had on theological subjects, he closes, by saying: "It was a pleasure to see him again. One just feels that one would be content to do anything and go anywhere with him." At this time, it must be remembered, and for some time after, Mr. Allies was an Anglican clergyman.

The book abounds with these delightful glimpses and estimates of men of note, and with extracts from their correspondence. It is a book that one will take up for five minutes, and read for an hour. It is highly interesting and instructive, and it is an important contribution to this class of literature.

EDITATIONS FOR ALL THE DAYS OF THE YEAR FOR PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS AND THE FAITHFUL. By *Rev. M. Hamon, S. S.*, Pastor of St. Sulpice, Paris. Translated from the Twenty-third Revised and Enlarged Edition by Mrs. Anne R. Bennett (*née* Gladstone). 5 vols., 16mo., cloth, gilt top. New York: Benziger Bros.

We might recommend this book without reservation, even if we had not seen it nor opened it. The author was one of the great men of the church of France during the present century. He was a worthy son of that worthy father and founder of the Sulpicians, Rev. M. Olier; he was Superior of the Grand Seminary of Paris, and rector of one of its largest churches; and, from 1830 until 1874, he directed retreats for the clergy of twenty different dioceses. He was an eminent writer, some of his works being considered masterpieces. Bishop Dufanloup numbers his life of St. Francis de Sales among the excellent biographies of the nineteenth century, and Monseigneur Bougard, in the Preface to the second edition of his great life of St. Chantal, attributes the success of the first edition to the criticisms of M. Hamon and his companions, before whom the manuscripts were read for more than a year. In France, Father Hamon's history is known, and his work is so well appreciated that more than 92,000 copies of this book of meditations have been sold, and the twenty-third edition is now in the market.

We think we are justified in saying that we might recommend the book even if we had not seen it, nor opened it. But already America has added her approval of the work to that of France. Archbishops, bishops, and superiors of seminaries, and convents use the book, and commend it to others.

Here it is before us; five medium-sized volumes, of about 425 pages each, bound in dark-blue cloth, with gilt tops, and enclosed in a blue cloth box especially made for them. One might expect to find in these volumes several meditations for each day, and meditations for the feasts of all the Saints. No; there is only one meditation for each day, and at the end of the volume the meditations on the principal saints. But the author tell of his plan himself.

"In the composition of this work we have followed, step by step, what we can so say, the Roman liturgy, which has so admirably collected together the whole of religion within the course of the ecclesiastical year, and under the direction of such a sure guide we have meditated: 1st, upon the mysteries which are the basis of Christian virtues; 2d, the Christian virtues themselves, which are the edifice to be built upon the basis; 3d, the feasts of the most celebrated among the saints, whose life is virtue itself in action; and we have endeavored to present these great subjects in a manner which will be equally suitable to the clergy and the faithful, so that our work may be useful to a greater number." After warning us that he will place the same truth or virtue before us in different aspects, that he will accuse us many times of the same fault, and call upon us repeatedly to renew our resolutions, the author continues:

"It is very important, in order to succeed properly in meditation, to fix precisely the subject on the preceding evening, and to arrive at the meditation of it already penetrated with what is about to occupy us. Hence, at the head of every meditation we have placed: 1st, an indication of the points of meditation; 2d, the enunciation of the resolutions which should be the practical consequences of it. We have added, afterwards, what St. Francis de Sales calls a *spiritual nosegay*, that is to say, a good thought, which will be the sum total, as it were,

of the meditation, and of which the perfume, embalming our heart during the whole day, recalls to us our morning's meditation.

"We have also placed at the beginning of each volume the usual morning and evening prayers. Lastly, we have added to later editions 1st, several new meditations; 2d, a more careful and complex index; 3d, a plan of meditation for an eight days' retreat; 4th, self-examinations inserted in the greater part of the meditations; 5th, various developments on several subjects of meditations."

Here is an author eminently qualified to do work of this kind; here is his purpose excellently mapped out, and clearly stated; here is the testimony of Catholic France assuring us that the work has been well done; and here is the book in an English dress for all who want to get nearer to God.

J. P. T.

---

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY: Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. By *Sylvestre J. Hunter*. S. J. Longmans, Green & Co.: 1895. Roehampton, printed by James Stanley. Vol. i., pp. 525.

We welcome this first volume of a dogmatic theology in English from the pen of Father Hunter, S. J., late Rector of St. Beuno's College of Theology. His position as head of this house of theology for the Jesuits of England, and his antecedents as a barrister of distinction in London, would of themselves be a guarantee for both the solidity of matter and the clearness of style which mark the present volume. His work on law and equity, published before he became a Catholic, were adopted as university text-books. In his day he had carried off the honors of his *alma mater*, Trinity College, Cambridge.

Since he entered the Church some thirty-five years ago, his pen has been active, either in editing works under his own name or in contributing privately to the controversial questions of the day. At present he conducts one of the higher courses in the philosophical department for secular students at Stonyhurst College. Those manuals, called the Stonyhurst Series, of Philosophy, now so well known in America, have emanated from this faculty. It was projected some time ago to continue that philosophical series by completing it with a set of volumes on theology, equally substantial with the former, in excellent English, and satisfying a need which exists in doctrinal matters, for the benefit of higher students and cultured people generally.

Father Hunter says in his preface: "No attempt is made to give more than the merest outline of dogmatic theology; but it is hoped that it will satisfy the needs of some who are not professional students, especially by showing the nature of the questions dealt with in each treatise and their proportionate importance as indicated by the space allowed to them."

This, we think, is just what is needed by such as, having received a sound religious education, desire to see all their religious knowledge put together as a compact whole, and the whole body of theology presented in a classical style of exposition. In the present volume, about one third, more or less, of the entire theology of St. Thomas Aquinas is expounded, with the following treatises shown in their due sequence and dependence one upon another: The Christian Revelation, the Channel of Doctrine or Tradition, Holy Scripture, the Church, the Roman Pontiff, Faith. The other two volumes will treat the special subjects God, the Trinity, Incarnation, Grace, the Sacraments, etc.

As to the controversial element in the author's manner of exposition

he himself tells us that the principles, as laid down, will, he hopes, enable the reader to follow intelligently the course of any theological discussion in progress. And, as no question really stands by itself, it is apparent why he makes so much of seeing all the parts of theology linked together as a whole. We consider that this lucid and pleasing style is no slight adjunct to the proper setting of the matter.

Besides the advanced Catholic student and teachers in our educational institutions, others too, those who have inquiring minds outside of the Church, and prefer a consecutive explanation to a scholastic method, will find themselves admirably served here. The author connects his matter, when needful, with the previous treatises on philosophy in the Conynhurst Series, and thereby dispenses himself from explaining over again what has fallen within the scope of his philosophical colleagues.

The consecutive numbering of sections, the changing head-lines which tell one at a glance where he is, the list of English books which may be consulted with profit, the little appendix on theological disputation in English, and—not the least commendation among the accidental qualifications of the work—the very satisfactory index at the end, all are in keeping with the accuracy and completeness visible throughout.

The type, style and printing which characterize the volumes of the Conynhurst Series, appear again here, from the press of Mr. James Stan-ley, Roehampton. On every ground we expect all success to attend the publication of this work in America, to the great profit of Catholic enlightenment. And we hope soon to see the remaining two volumes from the pen of this distinguished theologian.

---

GESCHICHTE DES COLLEGIUM GERMANICUM HUNGARICUM IN ROM. Von Cardinal Andreas Steinhuber, S.J. Herder: Freiberg and St. Louis. Two volumes, octavo, pp. 472-560. Price, \$5.00 net.

Well-deserved honors are accumulating upon the renowned German college in Rome, the oldest of those great Pontifical institutions by means of which Holy Church has gradually regained the position lost at the time of the revolt in the sixteenth century. At the last consistory, Father Steinhuber, who had directed the *Germanicum* for thirteen years, was raised to the dignity of the cardinalate; and he, in turn, adds additional lustre upon the college by the publication of the two volumes before us which, in attractive style, narrate the story of his college from its slender beginnings to the present day. We cannot remember that any other college can boast of a cardinal as its annalist; but few of the great seminaries would contest with the *Germanicum* the right of being thus eminently honored. It is now nearly 350 years since that great *Alma Mater* of cardinals, bishops and distinguished scholars was founded by the saintly energy of the far-seeing Loyola; and it would be quite impossible to estimate the amount of good work which has been accomplished by its alumni throughout the Teutonic and Slavonic races.

The history of the *Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum*," says the author, "forms an important part of the history of that religious renovation, through which the Catholic Church in Germany and Hungary has gradually recovered from the debility and devastation caused by the disastrous apostasy of the Reformation, and has reawakened to new life. The college was the principal means chosen by Providence to stem the food-tide of insurrection against the Church and to hold fast in the faith that portion of the German people which still adhered to the religion of the fathers. The manner of its foundation furnishes a new proof

of the ancient truth that Christ has built his Church on the Rock of Peter, and that the life and growth of the individual churches depend on their close connection with the centre of ecclesiastical unity."

It was the great legate Morone who, disheartened by the utter disruption of things in Germany and observing the paucity and unfitness of the native clergy, suggested to St. Ignatius the idea of founding a college in Rome, whither the most promising subjects might be sent and whence they might return to their homes well equipped with knowledge, piety and reverence for the Apostolic See. St. Ignatius took up the project with characteristic zeal, and overcoming obstacles which would have discouraged anyone else, at last opened the college on the 28th of October, 1552, with nineteen students. Then followed years of severe struggles. Sometimes it appeared that dissolution was inevitable. It was difficult to obtain fit subjects, for the road to Rome seemed long to the Germans. It was still more difficult to procure the wherewithal to support the institution. But God's blessing was upon the undertaking; and in 1573 the college was put on a solid footing by that immortal pontiff, Gregory XIII., who well merited the appellation of "father of all nations." From 1552 to 1894, according to Cardinal Steinhuber's computation, the *Germanicum* has educated 5748 students, of whom 675, or about one-eighth, have been Hungarians. During its 342 years of activity the college has given to the Church 28 cardinals, 47 archbishops (among them 5 electors and 21 primates), 280 bishops, besides a multitude of lesser dignitaries.

The eminent author has spared no pains to present the labors of the *Germaniker* in the different dioceses of their native land. The record is indeed a glorious one, of which the alumni may well be proud, and which should spur them on to emulate the zeal of their predecessors. When will some one of equal ability arise to discharge a similar debt for the great college of the Propaganda and for other world-renowned institutions? As the *Germanicum* was the oldest sister of the missionary colleges, which were all formed after her model, it is to be hoped that those who shall undertake to write the histories of the others will take Cardinal Steinhuber's work for their model and endeavor to imitate this admirable tribute to a great institution.

---

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN. Vol. I., No. 1, January, 1895. Published quarterly by the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Single numbers 50 cents. Annual subscription, \$2.00.

The AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW extends a hearty welcome to the "Bulletin" of our Catholic University. We regard it as a most valuable ally in the great combat of Catholic truth against error and unbelief in high places, a combat which (we hope we may say it without arrogance) our REVIEW has for years maintained almost single-handed in these United States. "The new 'Bulletin,'" as the prospectus well says, "does not conflict with any other literary undertaking of American Catholics. The field of its labors is yet untouched, and it justly hopes to receive a welcome from all who desire to see the standard of study and research uplifted among us." This field of labor is defined in the most precise terms.

It will be the object of the "Bulletin," primarily, to serve as the organ and mouthpiece of the Catholic University, in order that the friends of higher education scattered over the vast area of our nation may have an accurate and detailed knowledge of the work of the Uni-



ersity. It will "act as a hyphen between the academic corps on the one hand, and the world of American thought and action on the other." It will "be a means of communication with the great Catholic body and the scientific world in general, whereby the aim, the plans, the methods, the work, and the spirit of the university may be better and more widely appreciated."

As corollaries to this main purpose, it will "make known the work of the administration of the University, so far as it is of public interest, the material progress in the execution of the general plan, the benefactions, gifts, and other marks of good-will or sympathy which come to us. The methods of teaching will receive special attention, as well as the history and theories, old and new, of higher pedagogics in general." It will, moreover, duly chronicle the degrees given in the various faculties, the examinations, competitions, prizes, and relations with affiliated colleges and seminaries.

Special attention, it is promised, will be given to all important books issued, connected with the history of universities, academies, schools, and learned bodies. We venture to suggest to the able editorial staff that they construe this department of their work in the widest possible sense. Heretofore, Americans have gleaned but little profit from the enormous labors of European scholars, whose indefatigable researches in the archives of the Vatican, in London, Oxford, Paris, Vienna, and elsewhere, have revolutionized the story of the past. No one outside the quiet halls of a university, has either the means or the time requisite to catalogue the achievements of the numberless committees of different nations and provinces, that are working away, busy as ants or honeybees, each individual bringing his little contribution to swell the grand aggregate. Though, to tell the truth, there is no aggregate at present. The field of knowledge has grown so vast, that it seems impossible for any one man or set of men to take a general survey of it. If, therefore, the American Catholics are not destined to remain hopelessly behind "in the existing keen competition of talents," it is of imperative necessity, not only that we have an able body of men, like the faculty of our University, whose duty it shall be to keep a sharp eye upon the progress made in the learned world, but who shall also be prompt in communicating their knowledge to those who have not the leisure to bestow upon these important subjects.

There is plenty of room, then, for the "Catholic University Bulletin." It has a great and peculiar mission; and, we may add, its advent is welcomed by none so cordially, its importance is appreciated by none so keenly, as by the editorial staff of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW. We augur it, therefore, a long, brilliant, and prosperous career.

---

CURSUS PHILOSOPHICUS IN USUM SCHOLARUM AUCTORIBUS PLURIBUS PROFESSORIBUS IN COLLEGIO EXÆTENSIS ET STONYHURSTENSIS, S. J. Psychologia Rationalis, Auctore Bern. Bædder, S. J. Friburgi. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. 1894. Pp. xvii. 344. Pr. \$1.25.

This volume on psychology is the fifth to appear in the course of philosophy now being prepared for the use of schools (in the higher and probably highest sense of the term) by the German Jesuits. The four preceding volumes on logic, ontology, cosmology (natural philosophy) and ethics have been already noticed in these pages. Only one volume more remains to be published in order to complete the series, that on medicine.



What was said in the notice of its predecessors may be said with equal truth of the present volume. It is a model text-book, and this both as to matter and form. Its range of material is as complete as can be mastered by students who have not already made advanced studies in psychology. And the subject is presented with such admirable method with such attractive typographical aids to the eye and memory that the most exacting critic could hardly find anything more to demand in a book intended for class purposes. There are those probably who will object to the length of these manuals, and there will doubtless be a demand for a compendium of them all. Many however will prefer their comparative fulness of material to the opposite scantiness and will expect the professor of philosophy to form a compendium, if he need it to suit his individual purposes.

We are pleased to find in this manual of psychology a greater regard for the wants of the English speaking student than is shown by the preceding portions of the course. This is doubtless owing to the fact that its author has for some time been associated with Stonyhurst, England whence also he issued his volume on natural theology, which forms one of the series of philosophical manuals in English emanating from that institution.

Father Bøedder's aim has been to make his work both solid and timely. Accordingly he establishes thoroughly the fundamental truths of psychology, but passing by with lighter touch such as have but a general bearing on the main subject-matter, he dwells with special care on such as are essential for the student, in order to escape and refute the graves philosophical errors of our day. This judicious discrimination is evidenced in many theses. For instance, in the very first, where he combats the materialism of Vogt, Büchner, Hæckel by demonstrating the necessity of a radical substantial non-material principle in order to account for the act of sensation, especially in the case of man. The same may be said of the twelfth, in which is proven against the same class of adversaries, the super-organic nature of the human intellect; likewise of the next, wherein the capability of the intellect's transcending sensible phenomena is established against positivism, but most especially of the set of theses (33-38) bearing on the nature of the will and the fact and range of liberty.

Then, too, special pains have been taken to bring out into stronger light and more fully a number of propositions not unfrequently left scantily in the twilight. Instances of this might be cited from the treatment of the question, how the faculties are related to the essence of the soul (Th. 39) and that regarding the relation of the soul to the body (47-49.)

We recommend the volume as one of the most solid and on the whole most timely, and, in proportion to its range, most thorough Latin manual of psychology that we know of. Pervaded throughout by the teaching and spirit of St. Thomas and the neo-scholastics, it molds its subject-matter in a way admirably fitted for disciplining and informing the mind as to the bearings of a true psychology on what passes for the philosophy of to-day.

F. P. S.

---

LEHRE DES JOANNES CASSIANUS. Von Natur und Gnade. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Gnadenstreits im 5. Jahrhundert. Von Dr. Alexander Hoch. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder, 8vo. Pp. 119. Price 70 cents, net.

How so saintly a man as Cassian, who had enjoyed the instruction of St. Chrysostom and the other great masters of the spiritual life, who had

Moreover, taken a resolute stand against Pelagianism at the first appearance of the heresy, could have fallen into suspicion of error on the subject of divine grace, has always been a mystery to his contemporaries and to posterity. Was he really a semi-Pelagian, or was he simply misinterpreted? This is the problem which Dr. Hock undertakes to solve in the able monograph before us. After a careful examination of all the evidence attainable, he sums up as follows:

"We have endeavored, with the aid of Cassian's own utterances, to obtain a comprehensive view of his manner of thought and expression regarding grace and free-will. Our conclusion is, that our author had little intention of fixing the mutual relation with dogmatic accuracy and definiteness; he is, throughout, engrossed by practical and moral considerations. According to the immediate purpose and exigency of his ascetic treatises does he lay special emphasis, now on the divine and gain on the human agency in the affairs of salvation; and he therein shows his obligation to and mental affinity with St. Chrysostom. He has insisted on the necessity of grace for the work of salvation in all its phases; he has, furthermore, drawn a formal distinction between the divine and the human operation in the process of justification. In other words, he denies, on the principle of inherited sinfulness, that grace and free-will are of equal value.

"In his emphasizing the free moral endowment of man as against predestinationism and grace, his opposition to St. Augustine is apparent; whilst his anti-Pelagian tendency is seen in his assertion of the absolute necessity of grace. As to the central question, in what manner grace and free-will co-operate in the formation of good resolutions and actions, Cassian's expressions do not seem to be wholly consistent. A considerable number of passages speak of the absolute necessity of grace at the beginning of each good act of the will, whilst others attribute at least the effort, or attempt, or desire, or aspiration to man's moral endowment. That in handling this question Cassian betrays a certain amount of unsteadiness, cannot be gainsaid. The explanation of this is found, partly in the nature of the subject itself, which, as the history of the dogma to our own day evinces, presents various phases, and partly in the author's mode of treating it, which was anything but systematic and speculative. Cassian was far from wishing to minimize the just prerogative of grace, but neither did he wish to trench upon the freedom of the will, as is clear from his summary of his views at the end of the thirteenth Collation."

It seems to us that the author's view would be still more satisfactory if he emphasized the fact that Cassian's exhortations were addressed to an entirely different audience from St. Augustine's. The great Bishop of Hippo was forced into a polemical position which necessitated his insisting upon the power of divine grace to the obscuring of the human element. An ascetical writer like Cassian, taking for granted what every Catholic is well aware of, that grace is paramount, necessarily devotes his energies to arousing fallen mankind from lethargy by persuading them that their fate is in their own hands. It was unfortunate for Cassian that he felt called upon to point out the consequences which, logically of course, might flow from St. Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings, but as a matter of fact those consequences have been drawn, and must be in every generation vigorously repudiated.

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM. By *T. W. Allies*. Popular edition. Vol. I. The Christian Faith and the Individual. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

When this book was reviewed in the *QUARTERLY* of 1876, the reviewer closed with these words: "We wish Mr. Allies's work were in the hands of every priest and educated lay Catholic because, apart from other considerations, it shows clearly that the prevailing sceptical philosophy of to-day, in all its phases and sects, is nothing more than a revamping of ancient Pagan philosophic ideas, which, years ago, were weighed in the balance and found utterly wanting, even when tested by their own professed aims, and whose last word and final result, as a distinguished writer has well said, was despair."

This wish was not gratified, and one of the reasons was because the book was too costly. Now, however, this objection has been removed, for the present popular edition is published at a figure that places it within the reach of every one. The work has lost none of its excellence with the lapse of years. It presents the same faithful pictures of Roman civilization compared with the civilization of others, Antioch and Alexandria, bringing forward such witnesses as St. John and St. Paul, and summoning St. Augustine to testify to the moral and political results of such civilization.

Then comes the transition to Christian civilization. The comparison between the heathen and Christian man illustrates in a striking manner the effects of the two civilizations, and brings out clearly the excellence of the latter over the former. The two chapters on the married life and on the virgin life are particularly excellent, summarizing, as they do, the elevation of man and woman to the places which God intended them to occupy, and from which they had been dragged down by paganism. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster says of this work: "It is one of the noblest historical works I have ever read. . . . We have nothing like it in the English language. . . . No English work that I know exhibits the mission of the Church to the world—to the pagan world, to the civilized world, and, I might add, to the modern world, which is both pagan and civilized in marked degrees—in a more eloquent, more fascinating, or more convincing manner." This is unstinted praise indeed, and we feel that we can add nothing to it but to say that we cheerfully indorse it.

---

BOOKS AND READING. By *Brother Azarias*. Fourth edition, enlarged. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 123 East Fiftieth Street.

Some time before his death, Brother Azarias gave a lecture to the members of the Cathedral Library Association on the subject, "Books and Reading." He was afterwards requested to publish it, and after revision and development, it appeared in book form. Its reception was so general, that a second and a third edition were called for, and yet the demand was not satisfied. Now we have before us the fourth edition, printed on larger, heavier paper, with several additions to the text, and bound quite prettily in green and white cloth. We object to a white cover for a book that is to be handled and read. It is soiled so quickly that the owner's feelings in regard to it, if he be a person of any taste and refinement, are like the feelings of a lady mother when she sees the smeared face of her child. If the book were bound entirely in green or brown cloth, we are sure it would feel better satisfied itself. The new paper is most commendable, the wide margin is a virtue, the gilt top

and untrimmed edges, all appeal to the book lover. The additions to the text are a chapter on Dante, and chapters on George Eliot, Kathleen Meara, Mr. Augustine Bissell, and Tennyson's Workshop.

In the beginning of the volume there is a Memoir of Brother Azarias Dr. John A. Mooney. Former editions contained an index; it has been omitted from this edition, and we do not know why. The book could have both an index and a table of contents, so that the reader may find chapters and sections of chapters without having to search through the whole volume. We recommend this book to all readers, but especially to members of reading circles. They could not have a better textbook. Brother Azarias was a scholar and a philosopher. He is very reliable, and we were surprised when we read his statement that George Eliot had translated "Renan's Life of Jesus;" she translated the equally worthless Strauss' "Life of Christ."

---

CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Prepared and Enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, to which has been added a Vocabulary, alphabetically arranged, giving the definitions of all the words in the book, including the words of the prayers. By *Rev. James P. Turner* of Philadelphia. Publisher: John Joseph McVey, 39 N. 13th St., Phila.

Many editions of the Baltimore Catechism have been published with definitions of *some* of the words. Sometimes these definitions have been placed at the beginning of the chapter, sometimes at the end, and sometimes at the foot of the page. This is the first time, however, that all the words have been defined, and that the definitions have been arranged alphabetically in one place. As the editor rightly claims, a selection of words for defining cannot be so well made as to suit all needs, and therefore it is better to define all words. Again, when the definitions are given at the beginning or end of the chapter, or at the foot of the page, they cannot be referred to again, although the words may occur again in the text, and hence it is better to arrange the definitions alphabetically in one place. If the words of this catechism should be defined at all, and every one admits that they should, Father Turner seems to have adopted the best method of doing the work. Of course, it is impossible to define words so simply and so plainly as to suit all capacities, but we can safely say that the definitions in this instance are the simplest and clearest that we have seen. In many instances they are more than definitions—they are sketches of persons, descriptions of places, and explanations of feasts and ceremonies. We recommend the book to all who are engaged in studying or teaching the catechism.

---

THE WATCHES OF THE SACRED PASSION, WITH BEFORE AND AFTER. By *Father P. Galloway, S. J.* Three volumes, 12mo., pp. 525. London: Art and Book Company.

Beginning with the raising of Lazarus from the dead, and ending with the ascension of Christ into heaven, the author in these three volumes treats the life of Our Saviour during that period with a fullness of detail that we have not seen equalled. Persons, places, things, customs, dress, language, times, everything that the most exacting student may wish to know, he can learn here. All disputed questions are discussed from every point of view, and sufficient reasons are given for each conclusion. The quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and from the Fathers are all high exhaustless, and the manner in which the author presents each scene of the Passion, compels the reader to be a witness. The sugges-

tions for reflection are so skilfully made that one hardly realizes that they are suggestions.

This is a book for students and teachers. It is a book especially for priests.

The book is published in two forms. We must warn our readers not to buy the cheaper edition. It is but a trifle cheaper than the other, but it is printed on such mean paper that it is a disgrace to the *American Book Company* of London. The paper is so thin and transparent that the text can be read through it. The consequent confusion of the text of one page with that of the other, and the strain on the eyes of the reader, is deplorable. The publishers should withdraw every copy of the cheaper edition from the market and destroy it.

A RETREAT CONSISTING OF THIRTY-THREE DISCOURSES WITH MEDITATIONS, FOR THE USE OF THE CLERGY, RELIGIOUS AND OTHERS. By the *Right Reverend John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.* Bishop of Newport and Meneria. 12mo., pp. 425. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"These Discourses or Meditations are intended to furnish matter for a Retreat of eight or ten days. Each of them consists of devout considerations, followed by points for mental prayer. . . . Each discourse, with its affections, is calculated to afford matter for about an hour's exercise."

This book is really what it pretends to be—a series of thirty-three discourses on the principal truths of religion, and on the principal duties of a priest, with brief points in most instances after each discourse, for meditation. The author writes in an unusually clear, attractive, logical manner, and the reader is not repelled by the unnecessarily severe, and even repulsive, manner which too often characterizes books of this kind. The soul, and particularly the sinful soul, should never be shocked and repelled by the truth, but the light should be let in so skilfully as to move and convince. This is Bishop Hedley's way, and his book will do much good, whether it be used as a companion and guide during a retreat, or as a book of daily meditation.

The book is exceptionally well made, and is a credit to the publisher. The paper, the type, the binding—all are in the best taste, and it is a pleasure to be able to say this, for the opportunity does not often present itself.

CHRISTLICHE IKONOGRAPHIE. Ein Handbuch zum Verständniss der Christlichen Kunst. Von *Heinrich Detsch*. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. Price \$2.75 net.

This is the first volume of what promises to be an excellent and exhaustive treatise on Christian art. The author takes his stand upon the true scientific principle that since Christian art is the direct offspring of Christian dogma, it follows that the artist who undertakes to represent sacred things to the eye must be thoroughly imbued with Christian doctrine, and especially with a complete knowledge of Christian traditions. Instead of stringing together in alphabetical order, as has often been done, a list of saints with accompanying symbols, he takes up the different themes which have engaged the industry of artists, and beginning with the earliest extant representations, follows the development of the subject to classical and modern times. In the present volume he discusses the pictorial presentations of the Deity, of the Virgin Mother of Christ, of good and evil spirits and of the divine Mysteries. The book is adorned

th 220 beautiful illustrations, and is highly creditable alike to the author and to the publisher. Would that every one who aspires to be an exponent of Catholic artistic principles would begin by a thorough study of this excellent work.

---

THE CURÉ OF ARS. By *Kathleen O'Meara*. Reprinted from the *Ave Maria*, Notre Dame, Ind.

How encouraging this life is for poor struggling sinners. We are told that only saints enter heaven, and in the midst of our struggles we are sometimes tempted to think that no one can be a saint in this age. But the "Curé of Ars," we have a real modern saint, for although he has not been formally canonized, no one questions his claim to that distinction. Born in the little village of Dardilly, in the suburbs of Lyons, in 1836, and dying in the village of Ars, August 3, 1859, he may with truth be called a modern saint. The late gifted authoress tells the story of his simple yet holy life so charmingly, that the reader who begins the book will not stop until he has finished it. About 200 pages of a 12mo. tell the story, but it is very nourishing, and we recommend it without hesitation to every one.

---

RETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHENLEXICON. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Fünfundneunzigstes Heft.

The publication of this excellent Catholic lexicon is progressing, rapidly, indeed, but not rapidly enough to satisfy the impatience of the myriads of Catholics in all parts of Christendom who look to it for accurate and varied information in all departments of Christian lore. The 95th number lies before us, carrying down the revised edition to the word *Pantheism*. Among other valuable articles there is one by Illner on the timely subject of *Pædagogik*.

---

LEBEN UNSERES HERRN JESUS CHRISTUS. Von *E. L. Camus*, aus dem Französischen übersetzt von E. Keppler. II. Band. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. 8vo. pp. 599. Price, \$2.25, net.

This second volume of the German translation of the *Life of Our Lord* by Le Camus, continues the narrative from the departure from Galilee until the end. It is, we believe, the best adapted of all the lives of Our Saviour to satisfy the spiritual needs of the people. The book is excellently printed, and contains a copious index, and a good map of Jerusalem and Bethelhem borrowed from the atlas of the Bible by Riess.

---

DES PROBLEM DES LEIDENS IN DER MORAL. Eine akademische Antrittsrede von *Dr. Paul Keppler, O.O.*, Professor der Moraltheologie an der Theologischen Facultät in Freiburg. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Pp. 58. Price 50 cents, net.

An eloquent little dissertation on the ethics of suffering, in which it is demonstrated that Catholic ethics alone can grapple bravely with the mysterious problem of a suffering humanity, and present the only satisfactory solution. We should be much pleased to see the address translated and scattered broadcast among the people.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS IN THE ART OF SINGING PLAIN CHANT. Designed for the use of Catholic choirs and schools, by *J. Singenberger*. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

We are pleased to welcome the fourth and enlarged edition of this valuable little work. If our pastors would only become acquainted with its merits, they would place a copy of it in the hands of each of their singers in their choirs and of the children in their schools. Plain chant is as easy to learn as it is important.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

MAGISTER CHORALIS. A Theoretical and Practical Manual of Gregorian Chant for the use of the Clergy, Seminarists, Organists, Choir-masters, Choristers, etc. *Rev. Dr. F. X. Haberl*. Second (English) edition, from ninth German edition by *Most Rev. Dr. Donnelly*, Bishop of Canea. Ratisbon, New York and Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet. Price 90 cents.

A MANUAL OF SCRIPTURE HISTORY; being an Analysis of the Historical Books of the Old Testament. By the *Rev. Walter J. B. Richards, D.D.*, Oblate of the Society of St. Charles; Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Westminster. Sixth edition. London: Burns & Oates, limited. New York: Benziger Brothers.

COMPENDIUM SACRÆ LITURGICÆ JUXTA RITUM ROMANUM: una cum Appendice Juris Ecclesiastici particulari in America Federata Sept. vigente. Scriptum a *Innocentius Wapfelhorst, O.S.F.* Editio quinta emendatio. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGUORI, Doctor of the Church. Translated from the Italian. Edited by *Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.S.S.R.* Part I. General Correspondence. Vol. II. New York: Benziger Brothers.

HYGIENE, WITH ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY; being an amplification of Edward Catechism of Hygiene. By *Joseph F. Edwards, A.M., M.D.* Catholic School Book Co., 28 Barclay Street, New York.

JOURNALS KEPT DURING TIMES OF RETREAT. By *Father John Morris, S.J.* Selected and edited by *Father J. H. Polen, S.J.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

FROM THE GREEKS TO DARWIN; an outline of the development of the Evolutionary Idea. By *Henry Fairfield Osburn, S.D.* New York: Macmillan & Co. Price \$2.00.

CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By *Rev. Daniel O'Loan, D.D.* Maynooth College. Sixth edition. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. Price Six shillings.

SACERDOTIS VADE MECUM; seu Rubricæ Generales Missalis Romani in commodum Celebrantium usum. *Revd. J. L. Andreis*, cura. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

BERNADETTE OF LOURDES. A mystery. By *E. Pouillon*. Translated by *Henri Osbee*. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OFFICIUM PARVUM BEATÆ MARIÆ VIRGINIS. Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Office of the Dead. Chicago: Miehlsbauer & Berhle.

THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, OR THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD. By *Rev. Wm. Humphrey, S.J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE ONE MEDIATOR, OR SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENTS. By *Rev. Wm. Humphrey, S.J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.



# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XX.—JULY, 1895.—No. 79.

---

## THE RUSSIAN STATE CHURCH.

THE accession of the youthful Nicholas II. to the throne of Russia was marked by some unwonted displays of friendly feeling towards his Catholic subjects. A deputation of Polish nobles was admitted to the coronation ceremonies and received with marked consideration by the Czar and his wife, though it had previously been forbidden to attend by the Russian Governor of Warsaw, General Gourko. The last-named official was shortly afterwards withdrawn from his office, and as he had always shown himself a bitter opponent both of Polish nationality and of Catholicity, his removal was taken as an earnest of a more liberal régime for Poland. The young emperor, in one of his early proclamations, declared that he would make no distinction between his subjects on account of their faith. It is not safe to augur definitely of a young emperor's career from his first acts as master; but still, those words of Nicholas II. inspired hopes that the persecution now going on in Lithuania, and which culminated two years ago in the massacre at Krosche, would be relaxed or ended.

Almost simultaneously with the death of the late Czar, the Sovereign Pontiff had adopted a vigorous line of action for the restoration of the separated Christian bodies of the Eastern World to Catholic unity. Though this action was primarily directed towards the Greek Armenian and Syrian Churches, its success could not be expected to have considerable effect in the religious affairs of Russia. The Russian people attached to the State Church is by much the largest body of schismatic Christians now in the world. Though the Russian church is wholly independent of the Greek Church, governed by its own Patriarch of Constantinople, it is at one with it in doctrine



and religious practice. Russia only separated from Rome in obedience to Constantinople's action, and if the latter were to return to obedience, why should not Russia likewise? There is certainly no valid reason from a religious point; but, unfortunately, temporal interests are now, as they have been always, the chief cause of the continuance of the schism between the east and west. However, the conjuncture of the new Czar's liberal utterances with the action of Leo XIII. has excited strong hopes of reunion in many sanguine minds outside of Russia. What grounds for such hopes really exist, is what these papers propose to discuss.

A good example of the feelings entertained on this subject by many Catholics not familiar with Russian affairs is furnished by an article which appeared in the French magazine, "*La Revue des Deux Mondes*," at the beginning of this year. The writer, who appears to be both zealous and fairly acquainted with theology and church history, takes a favorable view of the prospects of union. He dwells on the religious evils of schism as recognized by Catholics and schismatics alike in the abstract, and urges that the present Sovereign Pontiff has proved his anxiety to remove all cause of fear that the national usages in points of discipline and language would be disturbed by the return of Russia to Catholic unity. He magnifies a few expressions of the Procurator-General of the Schismatic Church in favor of peace into evidence of a desire on the part of a large number of the Russian clergy to unite with the Church under the headship of the Roman Pontiff. Father Vanutelli, an Italian Dominican priest and brother of a cardinal, who paid a somewhat lengthened visit to Russia about two years ago and published a rose-colored account of that country, is quoted by the writer in the "*Revue*" in corroboration of his own optimistic hopes.

In those hopes all Catholics must sympathize and pray that they may be realized. The union of a hundred millions of Christians to the body of the Church, could it really be accomplished, would be a moral gain for mankind such as has been never paralleled since the days of Constantine. Before, however, we allow ourselves to be carried away by the brilliancy of such a prospect, it is as important to know what are its actual prospects of realization as otherwise, we are in serious danger, not merely of deluding ourselves with airy day-dreams, but we may be led into alliance with the foes of the Church in inflicting the deepest injury upon her and a large body of her children. While seeking to conciliate schismatics, we may become unwitting tools of hypocritical persecutors of the Faith. Such results have happened more than once in the history of Russia's dealings with the Holy See, and it needs the prudence of the serpent, not less than the spotless innocence

f the dove, before we can decide whether there is danger of their  
petition at the present time.

The relations actually existing between the Russian government  
and the Catholic Church are so different from those of other coun-  
tries as to be scarcely understood by the great majority even of  
well-instructed Catholics outside of Russia. The general opinion  
may be pretty fairly stated thus: The bulk of the Russians are  
Catholic in faith but schismatic in refusing to own the Pope's au-  
thority. The Catholic subjects of the Czar have full toleration,  
and the government protects their clergy and worship by its laws.  
Such, we believe, is the common opinion of American or French  
or Italian Catholics; but, unfortunately, as the Catholics of Russia  
themselves know too well, such is very far indeed from being the fact.  
From the days of Peter the Great until the present time the Russian  
government has been in name tolerant of the Catholic Church and  
respectful towards its head. From the time, however, when Cath-  
erine II. first obtained dominion over a Catholic population by the  
partition of Poland, the Russian *régime*, except under Alexander  
II., has ever been one of actual persecution towards its Catholic  
subjects.

When Catherine first seized on a large part of Poland, that  
country contained a population estimated at nearly five millions of  
Catholics following the old Slavonic rites, but as effectually united  
to the Roman pontiff as any other part of his flock. One of the  
first acts of the empress was to promise full religious liberty to  
both Latin and Uniat Catholics; but this declaration was quickly  
followed by the forcible enrollment of nearly half the Uniats in the  
State Church and the banishment of their faithful clergy. A repe-  
tition of similar measures, not without much bloodshed, under  
Nicholas and his successors has completely wiped out of exist-  
ence the whole body of Uniat Catholics in Russia. For them  
there is no longer even the flimsy pretence of religious liberty.  
They must be schismatics in outward appearance or leave their  
country. The massacre at Kroze, in Lithuania, little over two  
years ago, is a warning of the nature of the toleration which  
Russia extends to her Catholic subjects at present. It is abso-  
lutely needful to use the greatest caution in giving a ready ear to  
friendly words from the men who are responsible for such deeds,  
for we would not expose ourselves to the risk of being dupes in-  
stead of apostles.

Russian history furnishes only too many examples of the readi-  
ness of her rulers to utilize the zeal of Catholics for her own po-  
litical ends. Ivan the Terrible, the half-savage czar who played  
such an atrocious part in Russia in the sixteenth century, pro-  
cessed his anxiety for a reconciliation with the sovereign pontiff

when his armies had been scattered by the Catholic king of Poland Stephen Batory. No sooner had peace been obtained, however, than the negotiations for union were cynically abandoned. In our century, Nicholas used a Papal circular, garbled from its real meaning, as an effective weapon for suppressing the Uniat Catholic dioceses of Lithuania and forcing nearly two millions of Catholics into the official church of the empire. There is a very serious danger that the enthusiasm of well-meaning Catholics unacquainted with the policy of the empire may be used as a means of crushing out the resistance which is now being offered to the extinction of Catholicity in Russia instead of restoring it to the communion of the Church.

A brief description of the Schismatic Russian Church as it exists to-day may enable us to judge how far the hopes of its speedy reconciliation are well grounded. The majority of American and European Catholics have rather vague ideas of the nature of a formal schism. There have been in America and Ireland a few cases of schism on a small scale. It has at times happened that a priest has refused to submit to the ordinary authority of his bishop and the Church on some personal quarrel, and that his congregation, while calling themselves Catholics, have followed his personal guidance against the general law; but such occurrences have been always ended, at the latest, with the life of the rebellious pastor or by his formal secession from the faith.

The case is very different in the eastern world, where personal quarrels of churchmen have taken a national character in opposition to the unity of the common faith of mankind. The eastern leaders of revolt were not simple priests, but patriarchs having power to perpetuate their action by the creation of other bishops among their followers. The Greek schism, of which the existing schism in Russia is an offshoot, began with the personal ambition of a patriarch of Constantinople in the eleventh century. Michael Cerularius found the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff, which had been recognized by his predecessors, inconvenient to his own ambition, and he separated the bishops and clergy under his authority from the rest of the Church under pretext of some minor points of discipline in which the practices of the east and west differed. The emperors supported the schism from political motives, and the Byzantine Greeks, who had come to regard themselves as the only people retaining fully the old Roman civilization, accepted the separation with little reluctance. They still acknowledged in theory that the Church and its faith was one, and the Greek patriarchs never claimed any headship over any but the eastern Christians. But the policy of the emperors and the national prejudices of the Byzantine people were stronger mo-

ves than loyalty to the Church, and they perpetuated the schism. It continued as a dispute which should be some time settled by a general council; but as the Roman pontiff's authority was rejected, there was no human means of holding such a council in the minds of the Byzantine patriarchs.

Russia, when the unity of the Church was broken, was a newly-converted nation. It had received Christianity chiefly from Greek missionaries, and its church discipline was that of the Eastern Church. Its liturgy and church language were neither Latin nor Greek. The latter was old Sclavonian, and the former had been established in Moravia two centuries before by Sts. Cyril and Methodius, both Greeks, and approved of by Pope Nicholas. Russia, in the eleventh century, scarcely occupied a fifth part of the present European dominions of the Czars, and was almost entirely separated from intercourse with Western Europe. Its capital was Kief, where the Scandinavian warrior, Rurik, had founded a kingdom among the Sclavonian tribes of the steppes along the Dnieper and Don. The north of the present Russia was occupied by the Lithuanians and Finns, who were still pagans, and the south by various Turkish and Tartar tribes, Chazars, Huns, and Bulgarians. Vladimir, the first Christian monarch of Russia, had brought Greek monks and priests to convert and civilize his people, and when Constantinople separated from Catholic unity, Russia almost unconsciously followed in the same course. For nearly three centuries, however, there was scarcely any formal rejection of the authority of the Holy See. The Russian primate or metropolitan appointed the bishops of his country on his own authority, and received his own authority from the patriarch of Constantinople, as had been the rule before the schism. Catholic missionaries, like St. Hyacinth in the thirteenth century, were freely received, but the difference of rites kept the still half-civilized Russians closely connected with the schismatic patriarchs of Constantinople.

The conquest of Russia, in the early part of the thirteenth century, by the Mahometan Mongols isolated its people almost completely from intercourse with the western Christian nations. Kief and the territory around it, which had become comparatively civilized, suffered the most, and various princes divided the country into principalities tributary to the Tartar Khans, who had their residence near the great wall of China. One dynasty of those princes established itself in the northern forests around the present Moscow, among the Finnish populations, and gradually built up the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, from which the modern Russian empire has grown. The Tartar dominion over Russia lasted two centuries, and under it the government and customs of the Chris-

tian Russians acquired a character almost wholly Asiatic and despotical. The supremacy of the monarch over the Church became firmly established during this period. In the Byzantine empire after the schism, the Patriarch was appointed or confirmed by the Emperor, and the Russian Czars readily adopted a system which suited so well with absolutism in politics. Within a few years after the Muscovite grand dukes had become independent of the Tartars a Czar, Vassili III., gave a striking illustration of the fact. The Greek Patriarch was reconciled with the Church in 1452, at the Council of Florence, and Isidor, the metropolitan of Kief, followed his example. Vassili, however, refused to accept union, and drove the metropolitan out of his dominions. It was Russia's first formal act of voluntary schism, and its motive was not religious but political. It is the same motive which has, ever since, kept the Russian people apart from the Catholic Church.

The grand dukes of Muscovy in the fifteenth century, however, were not the rulers of the entire Russian people. Several large provinces, including Kief itself, the metropolitan see of the Russian Church, had been recovered from the Tartars by the Dukes of Lithuania, while the rulers of Moscow were still subject to the Mongols. The Russian, or as it came to be called, Ruthenian population of these provinces was jealous of its national liturgy but it did not relapse fully into schism. The union with the Catholic Church, effected at the Council of Florence, was not definitely rejected, but the Ruthenian metropolitan continued to receive his institution from Constantinople. The rise of Protestantism in the next century, and its rapid growth for a time in Poland, prevented a thorough union of the Ruthenians of the Slavonic rite with the Roman See. The czars of Muscovy contributed to that end by appeals to national prejudices, but finally, in 1594, a synod held at Brzest formally renewed the act of union with Rome. A few nobles and part of the clergy refused any communion with the Latin Church, but the great body of the nation accepted it, and the Holy See, on its part guaranteed the preservation of the Slavonic liturgy and usages to the Uniat Catholics. The union has only been broken by the despotic will of the Russian autocrats after the conquest of Poland, but it existed in fact for over two centuries and is still maintained in Austrian Poland.

In the dominions of the Russian czars any attempt at a union of the church with Rome was jealously forbidden. The monarch claimed absolute authority in spiritual affairs as well as in temporal. For a time the Patriarch of Constantinople was regarded as the chief authority in the Russian Church, but in 1589 the Czar Theodor purchased from the Patriarch the creation of a Patriarchate of Moscow, subject to his own direct appointment. Though

The Russian Patriarch was a subject of the czars and absolutely dependent on their will, the office was found too important for the absolute rulers of the State to endure. Peter the Great in 1719, on the death of its holder, made a remarkable change in the government of the Russian Church. A mixed board of bishops and lay officers appointed by the czar was established under the name of Holy Synod, and to it was given absolute control over the religious practices and belief of the Russian people. As the emperor appoints and removes the members of the synod at pleasure, he is virtually, though not in name, the supreme head of the church in Russia.

It is hard for an ordinary Catholic not acquainted with Russian life to comprehend how this absolute dominion of the head of the state influences all the practices of religion in the Russian Church. Its episcopacy does not teach that the czar is infallible or that the duties of a Christian towards God are not paramount to all others, but it does, however, inconsistently teach that in civil and religious affairs alike the will of the emperor is the supreme law for his subjects. That any Catholic could accept such teaching is, of course, impossible, and until it is abandoned by the Russian people it is simply impossible for them to become real members of the Catholic Church.

A sketch of a few of the difficulties which a Catholic subject of the czar finds in the actual practice of Catholic daily life will illustrate the wide gulf which separates Catholicity from the schismatic church of Russia. Such a man, if born of Catholic parents, is allowed to profess his faith openly in virtue solely of the toleration which it pleases the government to grant him. If, however, either of his parents, or even one of his ancestors, has ever belonged to the schismatic church he must attend its worship and frequent its sacraments under pain of exile. Even if such is not the case, a Catholic may not openly express dissent from any doctrine sanctioned by the emperor, or communicate his own belief to a member of the state church. He may not join with his fellows in any association, even for purely religious or moral ends, without the police sanction. A temperance society, an Association for the Propagation of the Faith, or a League of the Apostleship of Prayer, all these are criminal societies in the eye of Russian law. He may only receive the sacraments of the Church from the priest and in the church specially designated for him by the police. If for any whim of a provincial governor the Catholic Church is closed in a country parish, the members of its congregation must remain without worship or sacraments in many cases. They may not travel beyond the bounds of their district without special permission, and in many places priests are strictly forbidden to confess, baptize,

or administer any sacrament, even in case of death, to any one not inscribed in their own parochial registers. Police permission is required before a Catholic may devote himself to the priesthood or to a religious life. If he marry a member of the state church he loses all legal right even to instruct his children in his own faith. If he needs religious advice or instruction on points of his own faith or conduct, he may not, under heavy penalty, whether layman, priest, or bishop, seek it from any authority outside Russia, except by official permission. All communication, even on purely religious matters, with Rome, must be submitted to police inspection, and can only be forwarded through the Russian ministry. Under such circumstances a Russian Catholic forms a much clearer idea of the difference between the official Christianity of Russia and the faith of the Catholic world than is possessed by his fellow Catholics of other lands.

The external difference in forms of worship and ritual, though they would impress a foreigner strongly, are appreciated at only their just value by a Russian Catholic. The use of Slavonian instead of Latin in the Mass, the marriages of the priests, the absence of organs and other instruments from the interior of the churches, the jealous exclusion of statuary from them, while pictures enclosed in metal relief frames are everywhere displayed for veneration, are, as he knows well, matters of local usage, which in themselves are compatible with the practices of the Catholic Church.

He finds, however, other points in the practice and teachings of the State Church which are directly opposed to the Catholic faith. Divorce is sanctioned by the Holy Synod, and when it is a question of the Emperor's will it may be granted for any conceivable cause. The administration of the sacraments and the very days on which communion must be received are prescribed, not by episcopal authority, but by an imperial ukase. Questions of doctrine, such as justification by faith alone, or the necessity of baptism by immersion, are decided in the same summary manner as matters of State policy. Everywhere in the most sacred practices of religion the supremacy of the Emperor over the human conscience is proclaimed or displayed. In the ritual the names of every member of the Russian imperial family are printed in special type, even larger than that of the Almighty, and when those names are read or chanted, every orthodox worshiper must bow the head. The State Church, as a teaching body, only claims to repeat the decrees of the Emperor. On stated occasions solemn anathema is pronounced against false believers and the foes of holy Russia. Arius, who denied our Lord's divinity, is coupled in a common condemnation with the Czar whose dynasty was overthrown by the Romanoffs, and with Mazeppa, the Cossack chief, who made war on



Peter the Great. The actual schism of which this strange political religion is the result, may, indeed, have been based on errors or prejudices of small moment in the mind of any reasonable man, but it is very different with the question of the imperial supremacy in everything, which is the real cardinal dogma of the present Russian Church.

It may be asked why a Church which retains most of the essential Catholic doctrines, and which has shown itself ready to bend to every will of its sovereign, might not be brought back to Catholic unity by the simple will of its head. We would answer, that powers based on false principles cannot avail for good ends. Great as is the personal power of the Russian Emperor, he is only a part in the vast administrative machine which constitutes the Russian government, and which, receiving its impulse from Peter the Great, its actual founder, has never wavered from its policy for two centuries. That policy is essentially the fusion of all the races within the Empire, Russian, Finnish, Polish, Tartar, Armenian, or German, into a common nationality, obeying implicitly the commands of an autocrat, and ready to extend his dominions constantly and indefinitely over other races and lands. For that end, the Russification of the Empire, a State religion has been recognized as a most important instrument by Russian rulers, and the control of that religion is regarded as essential to their own autocracy. Hence comes the hostility to the Catholic Church which the imperial government has shown since the days of Peter, with only the partial exception of Alexander I. A religion which is above the control of the Emperor is not compatible with complete absolutism, and absolutism is the central idea of the present Russian government.

Absolute power in the hands of any human being is, however, impossible. It may be set up by legal theory and scientific craft of policy, but it is always limited by human weakness. There are few more striking passages in history than those in which the Roman historian describes the end of Tiberius Cæsar, the lord of the Roman world. His word ruled the life of every Roman citizen, even from his sick bed; but when a momentary faint made his attendants believe him dead, they hastened to proclaim his successor. The old despot suddenly revived, and began to issue his orders. The spell of submission was not broken, and the courtier crowd for a few moments were ready to obey, but a single reckless soldier threw a cushion over his master's face, and all was over. Russian Emperors have before now met the fate of Tiberius Cæsar. Peter, the husband of Catherine, and Paul, in the present century, were quickly removed from existence by a handful of men without even disturbing the general course of a despotic system. The fate



of Alexander II. is another instance of the dangers which surround an autocrat, even in Russia to-day.

Is there any strong probability that the present Czar will show courage enough, even if he have the will, to undertake the reconciliation of Russia with Catholic unity? We will frankly say we have seen nothing so far in his conduct to warrant a belief in it. After the first utterances of his reign, he appears to have resigned himself to following the policy of his late father's counsellors. The administrators whose hostility towards Catholicity was especially marked during the late reign, have all, except Gourko, been continued at their posts, and received flattering commendation from the new sovereign. Pobiedonosteff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, and virtual chief of the Church administration, has apparently been securely established in power. The same has been the case with General Orzewski, the Governor of Wilna and Klingenberg, whose barbarities in Kroze, less than three years ago, could only be paralleled by those lately committed in Armenia. Even Gourko, whose removal from the governorship of Warsaw was hailed with such joy by the Catholics of Poland, has been complimented by an imperial rescript, in which his measures for the Russification of that country are warmly approved by the present Czar.

Actual measures of persecution have not been wanting in Poland and Lithuania during the few months of the reign of Nicholas II. No later than last January, eighteen Catholic priests were arrested in the diocese of Lublin on the charge of administering the sacraments of the Church to Uniat Catholics, who asked for them, though officially enrolled in the state church. Only a month before, five country women of the village of Minoga, in the diocese of Kielce, were transported to distant parts of Russia for the offence of being enrolled in the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart. Finally, Nicholas II. has, within a few weeks after his accession, signed a decree by which no less than twenty-four Catholic priests, including the rector and vice-rector of the Diocesan Seminary of Kielce, in Poland, were sentenced to transportation, three to Siberia and the others to distant provinces of Russia.

This last case had begun before the death of Alexander III. but its execution is the act of his successor, now reigning. The charge against the twenty-four priests was understood to be that of having entered into an association among themselves while students at the Seminary of St. Petersburg, and also of having in their possession Catholic books not approved by the Russian censorship. They were tried in the Citadel of Warsaw by a military commission, whose proceedings were kept secret, the decrees of

ishment only being published. The facts, as given in the Polish papers, are simply these: In the early part of 1893 the police suddenly descended by night on the Seminary of Kielce without any warning and seized the papers and books both of the professors and students. Among them were found some copies of the magazine, "Apostleship of the Sacred Heart," well known to most Catholic readers, and devoid of any political purpose. There were also found some copies of an agreement, drawn up some years before by a number of Catholic students at the ecclesiastical seminary of St. Petersburg, who agreed to assist one another during their career with advice and aid in case of necessity, and to resist to the utmost of their power any attempt at perverting to the State Church Catholics under their pastoral charge. Such is the simple duty, of course, of every Catholic priest; but though Russia tolerates the Church in theory, her government has no idea of allowing Catholic duties to be carried into practice if against the will of the police authorities. So the seminary of a whole diocese, having a larger Catholic population than the State of New York, has been closed, and twenty-four priests of stainless character sent to consort with the vilest criminals as an explanation of the meaning of the young czar's first words of good will.

While the reunion of the Russian people to the Catholic Church is to be earnestly desired by every Catholic, we cannot see any special reason for expecting it from the new czar's policy. As Cardinal Newman once said of the conversion of England, it is with probabilities, not possibilities, that we have to deal in actual life. Despotism in government and schism in religion are so intimately allied in Russia that both must stand or fall together. Before her people can openly draw nearer to the Catholic Church, as some millions who are only schismatics in name only ask opportunity to do, it must be free to them to assert their choice in matters of religion. Before the Russian government can take any steps towards entering the Catholic Church, it must cease to persecute Catholics as such. The acts of Nicholas II., not his words, are, unfortunately, evidence that the era of persecution has not ended with the life of his father.

B. CLINCH.

PURE *vs.* DILUTED CATHOLICISM.

**M**R. MATTHEW ARNOLD has said that in his opinion, "the Christianity of the future will be the form of Catholicism. He did not mean genuine, pure Catholicism, but a sort of æsthetic ghost escaped from its dead body and surviving as a kind of separatist spirit, that can embody itself anew, as a transformed Catholicism which will be substituted for its own old form, and for all Protestant sects, after they are dead and buried. Dr. Barry, commenting on Mr. Arnold's statement, says that we all, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, have a deep interest in the question: "Is a transformed Catholicism possible?" Of course, he answers the question in the negative.

A great many, who retain and hold much more of Christianity than Mr. Arnold did, have a notion somewhat similar to his. They have a desire for some sort of unity among Christians who are now so much divided, a unity in which the Catholic Church and the Eastern churches will be included. They profess to believe, some less and others more, of the Catholic Creed; a portion of them, having drawn very near to the full Catholic doctrine.

Their notion of the way to bring about the formation of the new Universal Church of the future is one which requires a great many concessions and transformations on all sides. Even the Roman Church, to which they have very generally been obliged to grant a considerable pre-eminence, and which must play the principal part in this Christian re-union, they require and expect to make concessions, and to sanction a very considerable transformation of Catholicism into Neo-Catholicism. This is a chimerical. When the question is asked: "What can the Roman Church surrender as not essential to her truth and authority?" every Catholic must answer: Nothing whatever pertaining to her dogma and her substantial polity. Truth can make no compromise with error; authority can waive none of her divine rights which are necessary to the perpetuity and well being of the Church. The Roman Church can surrender none of her Creeds, from the Symbol of the Apostles to that of Pius IV. None of the Ecumenical Councils, from Nicea to the Vatican. None of the dogmatic decrees *ex cathedra*, of the Sovereign Pontiffs. None of the seven sacraments. No part of the Papal Supremacy, or episcopal

<sup>1</sup> See the article, "Dogma and Symbolism," *Catholic World*, April, 1888.

superiority. Not one single portion of the Canonical Scriptures. Not her Liturgy or Ritual, her independence from the State, or her moral code; and, above all things, not the infallibility of the Catholic Episcopate in its assembled or dispersed members, and its supreme head; and its claim on the loyal allegiance of all baptized Christians.

What is left, then, for the Roman Church to surrender? In respect to truth, the term "surrender" is inadmissible. The truth which she has once proclaimed, she can never disavow. The utmost that she can concede is by abstaining, for a time, or altogether, from declaring and defining, with a final and obligatory judgment, which she has power to issue, but wisely postpones or withholds, what is the truth, implicitly or virtually contained in the Divine revelation committed to her. Her authority to determine what is in itself of faith, and to teach this truth, no one can limit. She cannot surrender any part of this authority, or concede liberty to hold and teach any error in faith. But she may refrain from exercising all her authority, and leave schools and private doctors in their liberty of opinion and discussion, respecting many questions, which have not been adjudicated, and are therefore open. We may call this a concession to liberty, especially in cases, when at a later period, freedom of discussion has been closed by a definition, but also, though not so surely, when matters which appear to be definable, are still left undefined. When, however, the data for a definition seem to be wanting, it is more exact to say, that there is a recognition of the liberty which is in possession. Moreover, in respect to matters which are moral, the Roman Church can and does recognize the existence of a liberty *de jure divino*, with which she has no right to interfere, because she has neither given it, nor can take it away.

From all this it appears, that practically the question respecting surrender or concession in matters of dogma cannot be entertained by the Roman Church, in relation to any division of Christians calling itself a church.

At the Council of Florence, the Latin and Greek theologians discussed fully all doctrinal questions on which there was supposed to be a difference, the chief of which was the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. On every point, the doctrine of the Roman Church was formulated, and the tradition of the Greek Church prior to the schism begun by Photius, and consummated by Michael Cerularius was proved to be in agreement with it; especially on the two cardinal points of the Procession and the Primacy. The Pope, who presided over the Council, gave way in nothing. The Greek Emperor and prelates agreed to everything, signed the decrees, and were reconciled to the Roman Church.

The only concession was: that they were not required to insert the clause "*Filioque*" into the Creed of Constantinople, although they were required to accept the dogma.

In the time of Luther, there were several very serious efforts made to reconcile the Protestants to the Church, and to draw up a formula which they would be willing to sign, and which could be accepted as an orthodox confession. It was proposed that a general Council should be held, at which the reforming party should have representatives to plead their cause. But all these projects fell through. All this occurred before the Council of Tr  nt was held, and when some of the doctrines in controversy had not been clearly and finally adjudicated. At last, this great Council was begun, and after many sessions continuing during sixteen years, it was happily concluded. A series of magnificent dogmatic decrees was ratified and promulgated, upon which Catholic theology was solidly established for all time. The Holy See has since added to the definition of Trent the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and the Vatican Council has promulgated its Dogmatic Constitutions.

The definitions of the Church are final and irreformable. There they are; there is the Catholic faith. There is no room for reconsideration, compromise, or concession. All bodies or individuals wishing to be united to the Roman Church must confess this faith, pure and simple, whole and entire, as the *sine qua non* of reconciliation. There are many devout Protestants who are willing to join in Catholic worship, who would even wish to receive communion if it were allowed, and perhaps to make more or less of a confession. Still, they are not ready to leave the sect to which they belong, and by no means prepared for an unconditional submission to the authority of the Catholic Church. They are a kind of liberal Christians, with very hazy notions about dogmatic truths, and holding as an axiom that all forms of Christianity are essentially the same. Some of those who write and preach about reunion appear to think that the Holy Father, in his affectionate invitation to all whose ancestors wandered away from his fold, means to assure them that they will be welcome as they are to come into a merely external union with the Church, without any inward conviction and belief that the Catholic Church is the only true Church, and all her doctrines true and obligatory.

Of course, no properly instructed Catholic can entertain or encourage any such notions as these. Every Catholic, who has even an elementary knowledge of the principles and doctrines of his religion, must be aware that in order to be lawfully admitted to the sacraments, and entitled to receive baptism, absolution, confirmation, and holy communion, the subject must believe in his

heart, and confess with his mouth, the whole Catholic faith, pure, simple, and undiluted.

Above all others, those who undertake to persuade non-Catholics to embrace the Catholic religion, and for this end explain its doctrines, answer objections, and strive to remove impediments to faith, must clearly understand and correctly state all which the Church teaches and requires her children to believe, without subtracting or diminishing anything. We cannot suspect any of the advocates of Catholicism who have written for this purpose of any intention to make a compromise of any part of the faith. It is indeed impossible for a Catholic to advance anything plainly and openly heretical, and still maintain his ground as a sincere and loyal son of the Church. Nevertheless, it is possible to make explanations of dogmas and definitions which dilute their genuine and real sense, or in some way are indirectly subversive of their authority. Some writers of good repute have fallen into mistakes of this kind. With a laudable desire to smooth the way into the Church by removing scientific or historical difficulties, they have strayed more or less from the safe path upon dangerous and untenable ground, and have incurred reproof or admonition from ecclesiastical authority. There have been instances of concumacious resistance to this authority, ending in open rebellion and a lapse into heresy; for example, De Lammenais and Döllinger. But, happily, such cases are rare exceptions at the present time. Generally, those who have been engaged in the important and laudable work of advancing Catholic science in that intermediate domain which lies between the divine revelation and the whole territory of rational knowledge, and proving the harmony between them, have been animated by a loyal and docile spirit toward the supreme authority in the Church. Consequently, they have been ready to correct their aberrations when the paternal voice of the Holy Father has pointed out where they have gone astray.

The temptation to dilute Catholic doctrine springs from the desire to make it appear reasonable and to facilitate the return of wanderers to the true fold. But it is a great error to suppose that it can be made more acceptable to them in this way. Their great obstacle is the prejudice arising from misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the genuine Catholic doctrine. There are many, however, whose prejudice is against the pure Catholic doctrine itself. There is but one course open to the Catholic apologist in arguing with either of the two classes. It is, to make a frank and clear exposition of Catholicism, as it really is, and to marshal the evidences and proofs of its truth. If this suffices to convince the inquirer, well and good. If not, the advocate can do no

more, and he must leave his cause to rest on its own merits. But, in any case, diluting the doctrine will serve no purpose. Those who give their attention to the subject wish to know what the Church teaches, fully and completely, and not what private persons teach, as a sort of modified and improved version of her genuine, unadulterated doctrine. The attempt to pass off any kind of diluted Catholicism for the genuine article is sure to fail. For it must always, sooner or later, become manifest that the Church disowns and disavows every such undertaking. Besides, what gain would it be if a crowd of half-Catholics were taken into the external communion of the Church. Conversion must be thorough in order to be of any avail. Happily, the conversions which have brought a strong and valuable reinforcement to the Catholic ranks during the last half-century have been thorough, if there have been some superficial converts who have relapsed into heresy.

The danger of a repetition of the attempts of Jansenists, and the so-called "Old Catholics" of Germany to adulterate the pure Catholic doctrine, if it exists, is remote. If it is in any way diluted it can only be by advancing opinions on topics which are supposed to be left open to free investigation and discussion, which opinions cannot be made to combine with the dogmas of faith without a weakening effect. Beyond the line of explicit definitions there is a region of theology, where it comes into relations with philosophy, history and the sciences. It is on this common ground that investigation and discussion in which Christian and Catholic principles and doctrines are involved, find their field and scope at the present time. Nothing can be more noble or useful than this great work of Apologetics, though it is an arduous task. It is an effort to make a synthesis of all branches of knowledge, divine and human, to show their relations and harmonies, to remove their apparent discrepancies, and to accomplish a perfect demonstration and vindication of Christianity, *i.e.*, of Catholicism which is identical with it on all sides and in every department of human thought. The mistakes which even with their best intentions and efforts some laborers in this field have made, and to which human frailty is always liable, afford no reason for discouragement or the relaxation of effort, but only for prudence and solicitous care to avoid temerarious theories.

It is, however, necessary, in order to preserve the Catholic doctrine in its genuine purity, not merely to abstain from diluting it with alien and weakening elements; to avoid all diminution by concessions; but also to guard against the opposite danger of adding to it by amplification, straining the simple and literal sense of its definitions beyond their proper import. The censure pronounced



against some error may be extended beyond its intention, so as to strike an innocent proposition. The affirmation of some positive truth may be made to include inferences, conclusions, concepts which are distinct and separable from it. The proposition which is innocent in the sense of not being condemned, may be, nevertheless, open to dispute or denial. And the conclusions referred to may be more or less probable or true. But the judgment pronounced is one of private authority, and not the sentence of the Church. There are many things held and taught quite commonly, or at least, by some prevalent school in the Church, which do not pertain to Catholic faith or doctrine. There is much generally believed by the faithful which transcends the limits of the explicit and obligatory teaching of the Church. Now preachers and writers cannot restrict themselves to statements of dogma. They must throw their concepts into fuller forms and express them in popular language. It is very easy for the preacher or writer, in doing this, to interweave something of his own into the warp and woof of the Catholic doctrine he is explaining. It is not easy to avoid it, even if one tries to do so. Now, we do not mean to assert, that the exposition of Catholicism in sermons or in writings ought to be restricted to a bare and exclusive presentation of Catholic faith as defined by Popes and Councils. But only this; that where the object is to instruct Catholics or non-Catholics respecting that which must be believed as a condition of receiving the sacraments and as necessary to salvation, the private teacher should take care not to impose, on his own or any other human authority, more than the Church imposes. The region which the Church leaves open to freedom and difference of opinion must be respected, and the right of the individual believer to hold any probable opinion with a safe conscience. Often times it is not easy to determine, in respect to certain opinions, which have a character of novelty and have not yet been thoroughly discussed, whether they are really probable and tenable or not. In this case it is more prudent and commendable for private authors, if they are personally convinced that such opinions are erroneous or temerarious, to avoid forestalling the judgment of the ecclesiastical tribunal by positive and severe censures upon those who advance them, especially if they enjoy a good Catholic reputation. Opinions which are now universally regarded as tenable, even as very probable, or certain, had to gain ground at first by tentative efforts against grievous suspicions and strong opposition; as for instance, the heliocentric theory and some tenets of the Jesuit school. In these days many Catholics find difficulties in the way of faith, and sincere non-Catholics are similarly impeded in their search for religious and divine truth. Charity requires that the utmost care,



consideration, and tenderness should be shown to these perplexed inquirers, and every effort made to relieve them of their difficulties and make the path of truth clear before them. The satisfaction of rounding off a system, drawing logical conclusions, gaining a polemical victory, and making a fine rhetorical display is nothing at all when it is a question of promoting the peace, welfare, and salvation of souls. By all means, let argument and persuasion have full play, but not so as to bring undue weight of authority to bear on the conscience, and to increase the burden which must be sustained by faith.

There have been works published which have exaggerated some Catholic doctrines in an imprudent manner, some, even, which have had a detrimental influence, and have given occasion to adversaries to misrepresent and injure the cause of Catholicism.

By all means let us present the pure and undiluted Catholicism before the minds of men without any watering and weakening, but also distinct from a merely human theology, which is not the bread and milk suited for the nourishment of the children of the family.

Theology of the right sort is, nevertheless, one of the most imperative wants of the intelligent laity. An English theology for the laity has been hitherto a desideratum. Germans have for some time been provided with many most excellent and solid works in their vernacular. At last there is a promise of similar works in English, emanating from the indefatigable Jesuit Fathers. It is to be hoped that the theology in English which is in course of publication will supply the long-felt want in a satisfactory manner. The first and most imperative need is to give the laity a clear and exact statement of the *credenda* of the Catholic religion, of the dogmas pertaining to the Catholic faith, and all the doctrine proclaimed as infallibly certain by the supreme authority of the Holy See. Beyond, and in connection with this instruction in the faith, there is the whole field of rational philosophy and scientific theology—from the first and fundamental truth of the existence of God, the First and Final Cause and Creator, to the ultimate problems of the destiny of man and the universe. Every part of this domain is full of dangerous and subtle forms of heresy and infidelity lying in wait to ensnare the faithful, especially the studious youth, which must be combated and refuted.

The tide of popular science has been strongly against Christianity. Happily, it is now beginning to turn and set the other way. And now is the time for Catholic advocates to take advantage of this change. The popular mind is hungering and thirsting for wholesome intellectual food and drink. If we are wise and faithful, we will exert ourselves to furnish an abundant supply for this demand.

We think enough has been said in proof of the maxim that it is not "transformed Catholicism" which will meet this demand, but the pure, undiluted article, supplemented and supported by sound science.

Beside doctrine, there is also all that complex order of organic life, embracing government, worship, legislation, customs, practical religion and morals, which may be called by the common name of discipline.

Doctrine, considered as truth, is, of its own nature, immutable, not subject to control or alteration by law and authority. It is otherwise with discipline. There is an eternal law in the moral order which, being founded in the essential truth of things, is not dependent even on the will of God, but equally unchangeable with necessary truth. But there is a positive law, depending on the will of God as supreme legislator and on the will of the lawgiver to whom he has delegated power and authority, which admits of variation and is susceptible of change, within due limitations, by the action of authority, either divine or human. The Catholic discipline is in part of direct, divine institution, depending solely on the divine will, and above all direction from the will of man. The Unity and corporate Constitution of the Church, the Seven Sacraments, the Sacrifice, the Priesthood, the Episcopate, the Papacy, the Law of Monogamy and indissoluble Marriage, are of divine institution and above all human control. There are, in addition to these, institutions, laws, traditions, apostolic or ecclesiastical, proceeding from the will of human legislators, depending on this human authority and capable of variations, modifications, alterations in different times, countries and circumstances.

There is a wide difference, however, between the question, whether, in certain cases, the supreme power in the Church is absolutely competent to make a change in the discipline, and the question whether it can do so rightfully, wisely, prudently and usefully. The Pope has the absolute power to abolish the institution of metropolitans. Yet it would be a great abuse of power to attempt such an innovation. As an instance to the contrary, we may cite the case of priests in China being allowed to wear their caps during the celebration of Mass and the consecration, contrary to the universal rule requiring them to remain uncovered, out of reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. In China it is a mark of respect to cover the head in presence of dignitaries, and considered as very disrespectful to stand before them uncovered. Hence, it is wise to conform to that custom when ministering at the altar, and would be very foolish to do otherwise.

Some persons may fancy that there are many matters of discipline in which the Roman Church might make concessions to the

spirit of the age—to modern ideas and customs—in the same way and on the same principle that an exterior rule about wearing biretum at the altar could be changed out of deference to a national custom. It is evident, however, without going into particulars, that any general plan of a transformation of Catholic discipline to suit the spirit of the age and the notions and habits of some particular countries and classes of persons, is equally fallacious and visionary with a scheme of doctrinal transformation. The great number of Protestants who are longing to return to the bosom of the Roman Church, through some sort of compromise, dream of some such transformation of discipline, though it is in the vaguest and most general way. Some Catholics may be caught by a similar illusion, through their zealous and charitable desire to facilitate the return of these separated brethren. There is no doubt that the Church has always shown a flexible character of adaptability to different times and peoples, and that in matters not belonging to essential and substantial discipline there have been and are marked variations in the forms of external Catholic order. But all these things are and must be under the control of the rulers of the Church, and not subject to innovation and experiment from the caprice of individuals.

The measures lately taken by the Holy See in reference to the Eastern Churches have brought the differences existing between the Oriental and Latin rites into a quite general notice. It is quite likely that there is some common misapprehension of the attitude of the Holy See toward these Eastern Christians, as if there were a concession of the rights of the Roman Church; as if a new policy were inaugurated; but this is really not the case. What the Pope has really done is to reaffirm more distinctly and emphatically the assurance previously given by several of his predecessors, that the Holy See has no intention or desire to Latinize the Eastern rites. To those who are little acquainted with the past history of the ancient Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and the Byzantine Patriarchate which afterwards dominated over them, and became first a rival and then an enemy of Rome, the great differences in ecclesiastical discipline between the East and the West may seem to be startling. Powers and privileges were granted to these Patriarchs which were not conceded to Western primates. They had their own liturgies, rituals and breviaries, in Greek and several other languages, with peculiar vestments, ceremonies and customs. Communion under both species was allowed to the laity. Married men could be ordained deacons and priests. The Eastern discipline was ancient and in part derived from apostolic times. In respect to the law of the celibacy of the clergy it was a deflection and a degeneracy from the more perfect rule of

owed in the West, the effect of which was in great measure counteracted by the religious orders, the elevation of only celibate priests to the episcopate, and the prohibition of marriage after ordination. The existence of a married clergy in the East is a defect but not a moral disorder. And the Holy See continues to allow it, as it has done heretofore, even in the united churches. It would be very wrong to say that any dishonor attaches to Catholic priests of the Eastern rites, who are married men, although it is most desirable to fill up the ranks of their clergy, so far as can be prudently done, with young men who voluntarily assume the obligation of celibacy at their ordination. Even in Russia many of the young men destined for the ranks of the White Clergy wish to win this privilege which is denied them by the imperial law. The sanction of the Eastern discipline is not, as appears from what has been said, an approbation or concession of innovations upon ancient laws and customs. It is a protection against innovation; against every attempt to substitute the Latin for the Greek and other Oriental rites. Latin missionaries have sometimes adopted in past times a Latinizing policy very obnoxious to the traditional spirit of the Easterns. During the Crusades, the national antipathy of Greeks and Latins was very much embittered. A Latin empire and patriarchate were established by the Crusaders at Constantinople, which lasted for about seventy years. This was probably a most serious and unfortunate blunder. Whatever other mistakes have been made in the efforts to bring the Easterns back to unity, Leo XIII. has most distinctly and emphatically forbidden all attempts to Latinize them, and has guaranteed the protection of the Holy See to their ancient rites, customs and discipline.

There is nothing like a Protestant or Puritan spirit among these Eastern Christians, except it may be a few who have been seduced from their allegiance by Protestant missionaries. Their religion is only another phase of Catholicism; and if, on some one day, they could be all reconciled to the Roman Church, and they went to Mass and Vespers as usual on the Sunday after, they would not perceive any visible change or difference which had been wrought in the interval. Nestorians and Monophysites would be required to abjure their respective errors in faith, which would perhaps cause some corrections to be made in their liturgical books. The Greeks have only to abjure their schism and submit to the Roman Primacy.

Some of the amateur Catholics among our neighboring sects would very likely wish to see the Latin discipline modified in accordance with that of the Eastern rites in order to make their own reconciliation easier. If they could be united in their corporate capacity, retaining their hierarchy, ministry, rites and customs,

they would be very glad. But it is too late for such a consummation. The English Church and nation were reconciled in body by Cardinal Pole. But they fell away again into a deeper abyss. In common with all the other Protestants of the world they are without an episcopate, a priesthood, or any other attributes of a church. They are a mere collection of individuals who at the best, are only baptized Christians, wandering in strange pastures beyond the fold of the true Church of which they are *de jure* members. The question of Anglican orders is really and finally settled, and it is certain that they will never be acknowledged. Every Catholic who has been an Anglican minister must rejoice that the English Church lost the sacrament of order when he remembers what he has seen of the irreverence with which the bread and wine of the communion have been treated, even though this irreverence has in great measure ceased, through the spread of a higher doctrine. I can remember how the crumbs of the communion bread were scattered about and swept up; how at conventions the clergy would consume what was left of the elements, as if they were taking a lunch, chatting freely together; how the wine, remaining after communion of the sick, was tossed out of the window, and after a general communion in a parish church, poured back into the demijohn for use on the next occasion. It is a great relief to the feelings to reflect that it is only bread and wine which have been so unceremoniously handled, and that the Lord has not left his sacred body and blood in the hands of any of the numerous bands of the Protestant clergy.

Those Protestant clergymen who imbibe Catholic doctrines and sympathies, especially when they have misgivings of their safety and long for union with the Church, are surely in a difficult and painful position, when they are married men. They have to make heroic sacrifices in order to obey their conscience. Some have had severe trials and sufferings to encounter in the effort to find a secular career wherein they could support their families. Many have not had the courage to face the consequences of giving up their ministry. They are entitled to our profoundest sympathy and to every possible help which can be extended to them, to remove or alleviate the difficulties of their situation. These are the disastrous consequences of the crime of Luther and Cranmer in revolting against the Church of God. Happy are those who, being free from the bonds of matrimony, have the way to the priesthood open to them, and those who have an opportunity of going into some profession where they can be successful. Many converts from the ministry in England and America have been thus fortunate. But not thus is the case with all, who either take the decisive step, or would do so, if they saw the path clear before

hem. As the number of these increases, the case becomes more perplexing, and the obstacles in the way of conversion more unmanageable.

As it is, each one must come singly to be received as a catechumen, and then into lay communion, even though he were a bishop. After that, he must cast himself on the Providence of God and struggle for his existence as best he can. It is quite natural that this class of men should wish that they might be ordained, and ask why the Eastern discipline should not be allowed, in certain cases, within the Latin Rite. Those who dream of a corporate reunion of the Church of England to the Roman Church are prone to imagine that the bishops, rectors, clergy, and people might all be reconciled in a mass, and everything go on as before, in the same way that it would do in Russia, if the Church of the Empire were reconciled to Rome.

Suppose this extraordinary event to occur, would the Holy See consent to have all the English clergy ordained, and go on living in their parsonages with their wives and families, as Catholic pastors, like the white clergy in Russia?

It is utterly useless to ask this question, since there is not the faintest sign that such a visionary prospect will ever be realized. It is hardly possible that any sane person exists so completely carried away by his imagination as to dream of its accomplishment.

There are, indeed, some who dream of something not less inconceivable. And this is, of an Ecumenical Council of Roman, Greek, and Anglican prelates, in which the Pope will resign all but an honorary primacy, and a transformed Catholicism burst forth to astonish and subdue the world.

What is to become of the great mass of Protestantism in the coming centuries, who can foresee? It seems to be like the vast Chinese Empire, destined to go to pieces. According to present appearances, a multitude of its adherents will lapse into infidelity and irreligion, and the remainder be absorbed into the Catholic Church. The Church will continue in her unity, and, it is to be hoped, will increase, flourish, and eventually triumph. But the Providence of God alone can control the destinies of the nations which once composed Christendom, and accomplish the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ, in ways known only to himself. They are beyond all human plans, efforts, and foresight.

We must follow the advice of the Archangel Gabriel to the Prophet Daniel: "Go thou thy way, until the time appointed."<sup>1</sup> We must take things as they are, and do the duty which lies before

---

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii., 13.

us. We must first take care of the people whom God has given us, the faithful, to instruct and guide them in the way of salvation. We must also preach the gospel to those who are without, and endeavor to bring them into the way of salvation. From the multitude who are standing outside the vineyard, we must gather in as many as we can, to labor in it for their salvation, and to partake of its fruits.

This is an arduous work, and beset with many difficulties. There are obstacles in the way of those to whom we bring our message and invitation, even when they are sincere, upright, and disposed to listen to the preaching of Catholic truth. The fundamental difficulty consists in the chasm which has been made between the Church and the multitude whose ancestors abandoned her communion. The Protestant revolt was a renunciation of the doctrine and discipline of Catholicism, followed by the construction of new systems of doctrine and discipline, out of some Christian elements which the reformers carried with them. Their animosity against the Catholic Church has caused them to misrepresent and calumniate the religion which they abandoned. The separation of three centuries has produced such an estrangement that Catholicism appears like an institution totally alien from their conceptions of Christianity. It is an arduous task to retrace their way back to the Church of their fathers. In many cases, through the influence of divine grace, they tread this upward, rough, and difficult path, they have to encounter opposition, and sometimes persecution from their families and former associates. Those who remained faithful to their old religion in the days of Henry, Edward, Elizabeth and their successors, had to suffer many things, often even death. The converts who have been coming back to the Church, from the sixteenth century until now, have in many cases had to undergo more or less persecution and to make sacrifices. The early Christians had to face the probability of martyrdom as the price of their profession of the faith. At present, there is generally much less danger of undergoing any very severe suffering as the consequence of embracing the faith, and it is always becoming less as the common prejudices are diminishing. Indeed, it would be unjust to refrain from acknowledging that converts often receive only the kindest and most considerate treatment from relatives and other friends.

When it is otherwise, we can only encourage them by setting before their minds those motives which induced the martyrs of old to give up all, even life, for Christ and the faith. Namely, that the priceless worth of the grace of God is far beyond the cost of any sacrifice, however great.

These trials from without are not, by any means, the only ones



chief difficulty in the way of conversion to the Catholic Church, for the multitude to whom we extend the invitation to enter her sacred portals.

It is the internal difficulty of ignorance of the true nature of Catholicism, the prejudice coming from early education, the reluctance to embrace what seems to be a new and strange religion.

The one and only way to meet and surmount this difficulty and obstacle, is to set forth before their minds the truth and beauty of the Catholic religion, as the apostles did to the people of the Roman Empire, to whom they preached Christ and His religion. This is not a simple and easy affair. It involves the employment of means and measures, of many kinds and in great number. The great task incumbent on us, is to present before this great multitude surrounding us, the Catholic Church and religion, as the one true Church and religion of Jesus Christ, in whom they in general believe as the Lord and Saviour of the world. To set before them the evidence that this is indeed the Christianity of the apostles, of the martyr ages, of the Holy Scriptures which they reverence as the word of God. Though there are some, whose prejudice and animosity are directed against Catholicism as it really is, because of the positive heresies which they hold in a distinct and understanding manner, like the first heresiarchs and apostates who were leaders and disciples of the Lutheran Reformation, it is not to these that we can address our invitations with much hope of success. There is a much larger number, who do not hold firmly and with understanding to the specific doctrines of the old sectarian formulas, and who are therefore open to conviction. Moreover, some Catholic doctrines have gained a hold on the minds of a considerable number not only of the English Church and its American daughter, but also of members of other communions. Outside of the body of communicants in the Protestant denominations, there is a multitude, practically without any definite religious convictions, or habits of religious observance. Here lies the great field, white for the harvest, the missionary ground where zealous labor promises abundant harvests.

The great work before American priests is the conversion of as large a portion as possible of the American people. It is therefore a momentous practical problem, how to present the Catholic Church before them in the best manner, so as to manifest its truth and beauty, to convince their minds and win their hearts. What special means and measures can be adopted, to spread knowledge and to reach the consciences of men, in whom reason and the moral sense must cry loudly or faintly for a religion which can satisfy both the intellect and the heart?

The most efficacious of all these means, is good example, piety



and virtue shining forth in the lives of the clergy and laity as the good fruit showing the quality of the tree that bears it, the power of Catholic faith and discipline to produce Christian sanctity, which is one of the notes of the Church. The greatest obstacle to the fulfilment of the divine mission of the Church has always been the sins of her members, especially of unworthy ecclesiastics. The relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline and the consequent loss of respect for the priesthood was one of the principal causes of the miseries and disorders of the sixteenth century. In the true and genuine reformation brought about by the Council of Trent, the restoration of discipline gave back to the religious orders and to the clergy the lustre which had been dimmed and obscured; they recovered their influence and power over the people; many illustrious saints and apostolic men appeared, new orders were founded, especially the illustrious Society of Jesus, and in consequence there was a wide and thorough reformation of morals and revival of piety among the people in all the countries which remained Catholic, and effectual barriers placed to further inroads of heresy and schism.

The honor of the Catholic religion has been chiefly lodged in the hands of the clergy. The world looks chiefly to them as the representatives of the religion which they teach, the models of the moral virtues which they inculcate, the practical exemplification of the high ideal standard and rule of conduct which Christianity proposes. When priests are holy, the world sees what is the true spirit of the Catholic religion. And they never stand alone. They are always surrounded by faithful disciples, who follow their instructions and imitate their example. The effect of the scandal given by the wicked is counteracted. It is not the existence of sins and sinners which furnishes an argument against the truth and sanctity of the Catholic religion. Men do not condemn the legal, medical and mercantile professions, the institution of the family, the constitution of the State, because there are unprincipled men, swindlers, bad parents and children, worthless and criminal citizens. These instances prove nothing, unless the principles and the moral influence of these associations are proved to be the cause of the moral delinquencies of their members, a supposition which is absurd.

The Catholic Church is vituperated, Christianity is vituperated, all religion is vituperated, because their enemies unjustly impute evils and miseries which exist in spite of them, to them as their cause and source. For the same reason, God is blasphemed as being the author of evil, and the whole order of his divine providence in the world, political and social, is denounced as a universal law.

The worst of all the atrocious calumnies against the Catholic Church is that which accuses her of teaching and practicing demoralizing principles.

The Order of the Temple was attacked and destroyed by Philip the Fair on the ground that it had become an organized institute of impiety and vice. Opinions differ on the question whether the accusation was just or unjust. That there were disorders and many bad members in the order is certain and admitted by all historians. This would have been a reason for strict measures of reformation, but not for the abolition of the order, if it still remained sound as a corporate body. But the war on it was not based on a charge of partial and individual delinquencies. It was accused of having become utterly corrupt in head and heart, a systematic destroyer of the religion and virtue of the young knights and novices, a school of impiety and immorality. We express no opinion of the truth or falsity of the charge. But, supposing it to be true, we have here an example of a society in which depraved members were not merely wicked because they were unworthy and bad Templars, but because they were simply Templars, their badness the effect of the evil principles governing the body itself and showing themselves in the corruption of individual members. If this were so, of course, the destruction of the order by Philip the Fair, who was sustained by the decree of Clement V., was just and imperatively necessary, although in carrying out his purpose Philip sought to fulfil his own base and selfish ends and was guilty of great cruelty.

There is another signal instance of a great and powerful society accused of being an embodiment of wicked principles for evil ends and persecuted to destruction, viz.: the Society of Jesus. In this case we know that the accusation was not only groundless but absolutely contrary to the real truth of the facts. It is a matter of astonishment to any one who reads the true history of this illustrious order and then contrasts with it the unparalleled calumnies of its enemies that both can have co-existed and that malice and credulity could have reached such an extreme.

The fanatical hatred of the Society of Jesus and the persecution carried on against it by the most wicked rulers who have cursed Europe since the days of Diocletian were not directed against the order as their ultimate goal but against the Catholic Church and the Holy See. Those who have inherited this spirit of animosity and who still believe and repeat the atrocious calumnies of the unscrupulous anti-Catholic and infidel writers of the last century regard the Society of Jesus as the most perfect embodiment of the spirit of Catholicism, which they nick-name Romanism—a spirit which they regard as a wicked spirit. No one who has not

been brought up in the atmosphere of that dark and appalling tradition respecting Rome and the Catholic Church can fully appreciate what it has been, and still partially continues to exist in the minds of the ignorant and prejudiced. Belief in the worst calumnies has to a great extent passed away among the enlightened and educated. Yet we have seen these dreadful and most absurd fables repeated within the past year by fanatics and gaining more credence with the ignorant multitude than we could have believed possible.

It certainly seems extraordinary that the true church and genuine religion of Jesus Christ should become a victim to such black calumnies and implacable hatred among a people calling itself Christian, whose ancestors were converted by Roman missionaries and professed the Catholic religion. We ask, how could God permit it? His counsels we cannot penetrate. But when we look back we perceive that he has permitted stranger things than these of a similar kind. The Lord himself was accused of being in league with Satan and was condemned to an ignominious death. His apostles and a host of his followers incurred the same condemnation. The early Christians were overwhelmed by a flood of the vilest calumnies, accused of the basest and most atrocious crimes, notwithstanding their innocence and their heroic virtues. The Lord forewarned them that the world would hate them, as it had hated him. What wonder, then, that the same fate should befall the successors of the apostles and the offspring of the martyrs.

It is the totally false and monstrous idea of Catholicism in the Protestant tradition, so far as it still retains possession of the Protestant mind, which is the principal obstacle to the preaching of the Catholic religion so as to gain a fair hearing. Therefore, the first work to be done is to remove this obstacle.

It is not difficult to expose the lies which have gained currency under the name of history and to substitute true history in their place, although it is a somewhat laborious task. Modern non-Catholic authors have done a large part of this work for us already. Numerous and excellent Catholic works have been accumulating, during the past three centuries, in which the Catholic Church is completely vindicated from the calumnies of her enemies. The work has not, therefore, to be begun but only to be continued, and the contents of the learned and able works which we possess to be diffused in a popular form. It is easy to show what are the real and genuine doctrines and practical principles of the Catholic religion. It is easy to make known the long, unbroken line of saints who, in all ages, have glorified our annals. Easy to show what a multitude of devout and virtuous bishops,

priests, religious and laity, in all ages, have exemplified and honored their religion in their lives. Easy to show that the Catholic Church has been the one great religious, moral and civilizing power in the world since the apostles first went forth to preach. And, of course, the means of diffusing this knowledge must be diligently used by sermons, lectures, books, tracts and periodicals. The practical difficulty is to get what is written to be read and to get an audience to hear sermons when preached in the ordinary course in churches. Those who can be reached in this way are comparatively the smaller number and of the more educated class. The majority can be reached only by popular lectures in places of assembling which are not devoted to worship and, so far as reading matter is concerned, by publications in brief and simple form. It is more by an indirect action on this class of the people through the medium of the more enlightened and educated that we can expect to dissipate their prejudices. A liberal public opinion, percolating through the lower from the higher strata of society and finding expression in the newspapers, is a more universal and powerful agent in affecting this change than any direct appeals from Catholic discourses and writings, and prepares the way for them.

We return, now, to what we have said above, that the most practical and efficacious means of refuting the absurd and atrocious calumnies of fanatics against the Catholic Church, her clergy, and religious orders, is the exhibition of that virtue and sanctity which she requires or counsels, in the lives of her members, especially of ecclesiastics. We must not pass by the orders of religious women, the most devoted and the most holy portion of the flock of Christ, furnishing the most brilliant evidence of the sanctity of the Church, their Mother. But the course of our argument requires that we should confine our remarks mostly to the clergy, who must always stand foremost as the representatives of the Catholic religion, the laity, whether religious or secular, being a reflection of their teaching and example. They are the light of the world and the salt of the earth. If they suffer eclipse or lose their savor, nothing can supply their place. The history of remote countries and times makes but a faint impression on the minds of the majority of people. It is what is present, and before their eyes which affects them. Where the Catholic Church exists, in a sound and flourishing condition, and her note of sanctity is visible in the lives of the clergy, religious, and the devout laity, the old prejudices must disappear, and the calumnies of her enemies cannot be believed. The religion is estimated from the examples of it which are under observation. This is not indeed a positive movement toward belief in the divine authority of the Catholic Church, but only the re-

removal of the principal impediment, a preparation for listening to the preaching of the Catholic Faith. The Catholic Church is included in that wide and liberal estimate of all the organized forms of Christianity, which is now so common, and which regards them as all agreeing in the essentials and differing only in the accidents. The Chicago Congress of Religions gave the most striking exhibition of the great change which has taken place in the sentiments of a very large portion of the most intelligent, educated and candid American Protestants. But there are many other evidences of the same, in all parts of the country, not the least important being the general tone of the most influential secular newspapers.

This is very far from being an indication of a general movement of return to the Catholic Church. The conversion of America is assuredly a colossal enterprise, and it must seem to most persons one which is presumptuous and impracticable. That its success is certain, it would be rash to affirm. We will not venture to assert that it is even probable. It is certainly possible, though only by an extraordinary intervention of Divine Providence, and an outpouring of grace like that which effected the conversion of the Roman Empire. The conversion of a great multitude is however, morally certain, if due efforts are made for that end. There are already many thousands of converts, and they are found among all ranks of society and all professions, and from many sects, even Unitarians and Jews, as well as from that great body which may be called non-sectarian. The fruit of one week's mission to Protestants in St. Paul's Church, New York, was a hundred converts. It is retorted by some Anti-Catholic writer, that many Catholics fall off from the Church, and that Protestant sects make proselytes, some of whom are priests. But there is no parallelism in the case. No Protestant sect can show a list of proselytes comparable to the catalogue of Catholic converts. Apostate priests are generally men who are no loss to the Church, and no gain to any sect, if they join one, which they generally do not, but go into a secular calling without professing any religion, and if they sometimes preserve a worldly respectability, they are exceptions, and the greater number become disreputable characters, who sometimes try to repent at the end of their lives. The most distinguished among these exceptional characters in recent times, is William Gifford Palgrave, second son of the well-known Sir Francis Palgrave, an Oxford graduate, a convert, a zealous Jesuit missionary for fifteen years, a great scholar and traveller, finally British minister at Uruguay. He abandoned his Order, the Church, and Christianity, was near embracing Shintoism, married, and at last, two or three years before his death, which occurred in 1891, he was reconciled to the Church. The value of his testimony to the power of the Catholic

religion over the reason and conscience is even enhanced by his long estrangement. De Lammenais, Loyson, Döllinger, and the few other men of mark who have abandoned the Church within the last half century have not furnished any occasion of congratulation to Protestants. Since the defection of the sixteenth century, there has been no intellectual or moral current carrying away Catholics from motives of conviction or religious devotion into Protestantism. On the contrary, from the sixteenth century to the present time, there has been a stream, sometimes larger, sometimes smaller, in Germany and in England, bringing back from rational and religious motives, as the result of study and thought, and for the sake of making the conscience secure, a large number of the most sincere and earnest members and ministers of the Protestant churches, to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Persons in all walks of life, of all sorts of early breeding, of very various mental and moral temperament and habits, and by many separate paths, have come back to the ancient religion of their fathers. These specimens suggest the thought, that there is no sufficient reason why for each one, there might not be a hundred or a thousand similar examples. How many there have been who have not had the courage of their convictions, we cannot know, but every one who has had experience in this line knows that they are not few. Besides those who have stifled their convictions, there are many others who have begun, and perhaps proceeded far on the way toward a formed conviction of the truth of Catholicism, but have topped short, and have either rested in some semi-catholic theory, as did Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon, or have retrograded into rationalism.

Here we find ourselves dealing with phenomena which elude analysis and explanation, and do not afford any sure anticipations of the future. There are mysteries in the operations of divine grace, and the workings of the human mind and conscience, which are inscrutable.

We have seen that the great obstacle to the return of the estranged children of the Church to her bosom is a false view of what the Catholic doctrine and religion really are. When this impediment is removed, and Catholicism is revealed as it really and truly is, there are other obstacles hindering its acceptance, thus far, by the majority. When the Catholic Church is beheld as it really is, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, it is its own witness, and proves itself. It is like the Capitol at Washington, like St. Peter's Church at Rome, like a great battleship flying its national standard. It shows itself to the beholder, on a first view, for what it really is. The note of sanctity is obscured by the calumnies which have created prejudice and by the actual

scandals which have existed, defacing the pages of ecclesiastical history. When this obscurity is removed, and the note of sanctity is made to shine out in all its lustre, the other notes are so obvious that it becomes self-evident that either the one Church which alone claims the exclusive possession of these prerogatives is the true Church of Christ, or that there is no organized society existing which has a right to this name. None of the self-styled churches pretend to be the one Church, to the exclusion of all others, but only to be parts of a more universal society. None of them claim to possess, exclusively, the note of sanctity. There is no appearance or claim of Catholicity in any one of them. They all claim that they are apostolic in a certain sense, that is, conformable to the apostolic model, and some of them profess to have an apostolic succession in their bishops. But no one of them pretends to have an organized episcopal college possessing, exclusively and completely, the teaching, law-giving, and governing authority and power of the apostolic college. Either there is no organized undivided body, which is the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and there are, at most, only separated parts of the former united whole, or this church is the Catholic Church, which is concentrated in the Supreme See of Rome and governed by the successor of St. Peter.

This is the universal judgment of all men who are intelligent enough to form any opinion on the subject, whether they call themselves Christians or not. Atheists will admit that if there is a God, the only form of religion worthy of him is Catholicism. Rationalists and Jews will admit that if Jesus Christ is God, the only consistent form of Christianity is Catholicism. All kinds of Protestants will admit that if St. Peter was made the Vicar of Christ, with a perpetual line of successors, the Pope is the successor of St. Peter.

But all those who are alien to the Catholic communion take the negative side of the alternative as it presents itself to their view. Many deny the existence of God and of any religion; others deny that there is any supernatural and revealed religion; others, still, deny that the revelation of truth and law has been committed to any visible church; and others, that this church is essentially constituted in an organic, indivisible unity.

Those who disbelieve in all religion, or in that Christianity which is based on the divinity of Christ, have first to be convinced of the primary articles of the Christian creed before they can listen to any argument for the Catholic Church. The great multitude who are practically infidels, without thought or care for their souls and the future life, and therefore living to a greater or lesser degree in habitual sin, have to be awakened from their far



slumber to repentance, and the desire to find the way of pardon and salvation. Such as these, if their consciences are awakened by the preaching of apostolic missionaries, will be easily brought to submit themselves entirely to their direction, being free from the bias of any different religious doctrine.

Those who have a firm and practical belief in the primary articles of the Christian creed, must be convinced and persuaded by means of the positive principles and doctrines which they actually hold, that they are intellectually and morally bound to follow them out to their legitimate conclusions, and to complete the sphere of which they possess a half or three quarters.

For some the process is short and easy when the Catholic Church is once presented to them as it really is. But for others the process is longer, sometimes very long and slow, as in the case of Mary Howitt, in whom it was completed only after her eightieth year.

With the majority of those who have freed themselves from the fetters of anti-Catholic prejudice, and who have no hostile aversion from Catholicism, their progress is arrested by some hindrance, and it becomes an anxious inquiry what is the hindrance which is the most common and the most serious. Of course there are those who are tenaciously attached to the doctrines and practices of some sect with which they are satisfied, and who do not look beyond their own narrow environment. But those who have more enlarged views and sympathies cannot think that the present state of division and even conflict among Christians is normal and must be perpetual, and they must look forward to some change, especially if they anticipate the progress and wide extension of Christianity as the world-religion. There is a dawning light everywhere of the Catholic idea, an aspiration for universal brotherhood and co-operation among all who call themselves disciples of Christ. It seems almost impossible that any intelligent person can believe that the American people and those of Europe can ever become generally Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists, or even Protestant Episcopalians, and after that the conversion of the heathen be accomplished.

The fanatical Scotch Covenanters, and the wild Fifth Monarchy men of Cromwell's time, who never reasoned, could believe anything. The Puritans really hoped that they were founding in New England a kingdom of God which would extend its sway over the whole world. But such illusions cannot now pass current. The handful of enthusiasts who call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church, look for the personal coming of Christ to establish his kingdom on the earth. But sober, sensible men look rather to a reunion of Christians to be brought about by a normal development



of religion from universal principles recognized as a common possession, and attracting the separated elements into the cohesion of unity.

They have an idea of a Catholic Christianity which shall supersede the particularism of divided sects.

And yet this is precisely what keeps a large number who have the most respectful and amicable sentiments toward the Catholic Church stationary where they are, or at least retards their motion. Instead of the genuine Catholicism, there looms up before their imagination the vision of a transformed Catholicism, such as that which Lord Halifax and other High Churchmen construct by an amalgamation of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, or, as Dr. Schaff, as may be seen in his paper read before the Congress of Religions, of these, together with all the self-styled Evangelical Churches. So, the Anglican consoles himself with the thought that he is already a Catholic, awaiting corporate reunion, to be effected by the several hierarchies meeting in a general council. Others come to the same practical conclusion, that they possess already all the essentials, and can abide with a safe conscience where they are, and hoping for the coming era, when all Christians will be brought into fraternal union and harmony.

In all these theoretical and imaginary speculations there is wanting the true conception of the Unity of the Church, and of a dogmatic teaching of the entire system of Christian doctrine, which is infallibly certain, and unchangeable except in the sense of a legitimate development directed by authority. They are, therefore, mere cloud-castles. Such a united Christendom as these dreamers would fain see constructed, is a chimera. There is a still more extravagant chimera, that which Lessing's poetical imagination has endeavored to reduce to the semblance of a definite form in his poem of "Nathan the Wise," and which is the dream of some visionaries of the present time, a world-religion made out of all the theodicies existing in the world combined together.

The one and only world-religion is Christianity. Christianity is Catholicism. Not a vague, indeterminate, nebulous Catholicism awaiting its form, but the definite, concrete religion of the One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, which was from the beginning is now, and will continue to the end of the world.

There is no union of all Christians possible except in the communion of this Church. How are those who are without to be brought within this communion? It has already been shown sufficiently that it cannot and will not be effected by any dogmatic concession and compromise. There is but one course open; to present pure, undiluted Catholic doctrine to the world, to be accepted or rejected. But how about the discipline? Does the

existing discipline place any barriers which can be removed by concessions or modifications which ecclesiastical authority has full power to make, and that without prejudice to the well-being of the Church?

There is a part of discipline founded in dogma, and above any human power to change. The Papal and Episcopal constitution, the authority of Ecumenical Councils, all that is essential in the offering of the Sacrifice and the administration of Sacraments, and whatever else is established by Divine law, is unchangeable. All that rests solely on ecclesiastical law is within the scope of the supreme power of the Church. Much of this is so long and so firmly embedded in the structure and order of the Catholic religion that it is practically unchangeable, and cannot be justly or prudently modified. There is also a practical application of the universal principles and laws of discipline in different countries and periods which is variable, and has been continually varied as the occasions have arisen. There is, besides, an environment of local and particular customs which spring up spontaneously, like the undergrowth in a forest. There is always in the popular religion a great deal which is Catholic, in the sense of being consistent with Catholic doctrine and law, but not Catholic in the sense of being obligatory or of universal fitness. There is no reason why one should imitate customs which prevail in any Catholic country from a notion that we thereby make ourselves more Catholic, whereas we are only striving to become French, Spanish, or Italian. Our accidental clothing ought to fit ourselves, and we fit our clothing. There is no sense in imitating French vestments, dressing up sacred images like the Spaniards, fitting up churches without Jews as in old times, and some foreign countries, adopting books and practices of devotion suitable for other times and places but not for those with whom we have to deal in our own time and place. The mission exercises of St. Alphonsus were all held in the daytime, for night services in churches in Italy are unknown, and would not be approved if they were attempted. In this country missions would be impossible unless the people were assembled before daylight and after dark. The necessity of the case has brought about not only a diminution of the number of holidays of obligation, but a practical relaxation of the law forbidding servile labor on those which remain, excepting Christmas and New Year's Day, as also the precepts of abstinence and fasting from which large dispensations are given. The congresses in which laymen take a prominent part, other conventions of various kinds, and the summer schools which have begun to be held, are remarkable instances of new measures and methods which have been adopted. The participation of Catholic prelates in the Columbian

Congress of Religions is the most striking of all the innovations on old ways which has occurred. These and many other instances which might be adduced prove that the Church has no ironbound inflexible policy in the methods and measures by which her discipline is practically applied. It is, therefore, quite proper to examine and consider what methods and measures are the wisest and best adapted to their purpose in laboring for the reconciliation of Protestants to the Catholic Church.

The first and principal work to be done is the removal of impediments, the chief of which we have already shown to be a false idea of what the Church really is. The true way to remove this obstacle is to present the true idea of Catholicism, to exhibit Catholic doctrine in its undiluted purity, without addition or diminution: and Catholic discipline, also, in its integrity; the Faith and the Law, the Spirit and the Body of the Catholic religion subsisting in organic unity. This is the reality to be opposed to the chimera of transformed Catholicism, to every form of sectarianism, to rationalism and agnosticism. If its face and figure fail to win the love of any beholders, and their aversion to Catholicism remains as a fixed quantity, it is then an aversion to the true and genuine Catholicism.

It is a great mistake to suppose that any concession in matters which are not pertaining to dogma, or to the strictly essential parts of government, worship and practical order, will avail anything to overcome this aversion. The aversion has the essential for its object. All we have to do is to present the Catholic religion in its true aspect, and as for results, they are beyond our control, so that we have no responsibility.

There are three essential elements which are the constituent principles of the Catholic religion: Dogma, Authority, Worship including the Sacraments which cluster around the great central Act of Worship, branching out and blooming into ritual and all the rich and variegated flowers of architecture, sculpture, painting and music. These are what have attracted the intelligent and educated converts, who have tried the Lutheran and Anglican forms of Protestantism, one or both, and finding the Mene-Tekel written on their walls, have sought for certainty and completeness of faith, for divine authority in lawgiving and government, for a worship worthy of God and a pure fountain of grace in the Catholic Church.

The only way to attract the multitude who are without to follow their example is to preach, to live, to build up and embody this pure and genuine Catholicism. It is useless to contrive some way of bringing it down to their level, to invent a policy or system conformed to their particular traditions and customs, by tampering

with hierarchical and liturgical forms and order. Those who have not been practically familiar with Protestantism by their experience as members or ministers within some one of its sects, may make mistakes as to the obstacles which impede conversion and the way to remove them. It is not strict ecclesiastical discipline or the outward vesture with which the Church clothes herself which are repulsive. The clergy will not win respect and friendship by adopting secular costume and sinking the priest in the man of the world and society. The government of the Church will not win more approbation by being made less hierarchical and more popular. The public services of the Church will not be made more attractive by a puritan reformation. What scandalizes right-thinking and right-feeling people is insubordination and disrespect toward bishops, divisions and disputes of the clergy, resort to the newspaper methods of partisan warfare, slovenliness about churches and their precincts, a negligent manner of performing sacerdotal functions, and everything else which shows a disregard of ecclesiastical discipline. These are what bring discredit on the Catholic religion. Of course, serious moral delinquency of ecclesiastics, and the scandals of the hangers-on and camp-followers of the Catholic community, the saloon-keepers and saloon-frequenters and such like, are still worse. In short, just so far as the Catholic ideal is carried out in practice, the religion is honored and respected in the world, and all deviations from it have the contrary effect.

The mission of the clergy is, first of all, to cultivate Christian piety and virtue among their people, to co-operate in all wise measures for reforming political and social vices, to work for the amelioration of the condition of workingmen and the poor, to encourage every effort to make good citizens, to teach lessons of patriotism, and in all ways to be the apostles of practical Christianity. And after this, to do all that is possible to invest the Catholic religion with the outward garment of the beauty of holiness, and make the body, by its adornment, show forth the celestial qualities of the spirit which animates it. Then, finally, to preach and exhibit this holy religion to the world without, and only on these conditions can this be done successfully.

A. F. HEWIT, C. S. P.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

## ABOUT THE UTAH SAINTS.

THE Mormons have always regarded the island of Great Britain as their best recruiting-ground. On Christmas Day, 1837, their leaders held a conference at Preston, at which they announced that their disciples in England alone numbered a thousand. Forty-one left England for Utah June 6, 1840, being "the first saints that gathered from a foreign land." From those early times to the present Mormonism has been gaining a steadily increasing number of its adherents in Great Britain. Every State in the Union is also represented among them. And it is somewhat singular that little has been done to place before the English-speaking world the real nature of a sect which has attracted so many of the just and the unjust, despite its awful fanaticism. To develop the tenets and policy of the Latter Day Saints in a single article would not be possible. But, without describing their baptism for the dead, their celestial marriage (a euphemism for polygamy), polytheism, the deification of Adam, whom Brigham Young blasphemously styled "the god of the universe," we will give some information, gathered on the spot, of the workings of this peculiar offshoot of Protestantism, merely premising that its distinctive features were polygamy, *plus* politics, farming and commerce. To build up the kingdom, to possess the earth and the fulness thereof, to gratify passion, to make money—behold the ends which were held to justify the most atrocious ways and means since Joseph Smith "made a gathering of the saints" in Ohio and promulgated the "Book of Mormon" early in the thirties.

Away among the western mountains of North America, in a picturesque valley, whose inhabitants of a generation or two ago were wont to describe themselves as living "a thousand miles from everywhere," on the southern slope of a spur of the Wasatch range is the capital of Mormondom, called from the dead sea towards which it looks, Salt Lake City. By the "saints," indeed, it is styled Zion, or the New Jerusalem. And the sluggish stream that laves its banks is euphoniously called the "Jordan River." But to the Gentile world Zion is known by its more commonplace name. In early days it was described to outer barbarians as *Great Salt Lake City*. To the name of every new place in the west it is customary to add, with reference to the future rather than the present, the imposing word *City*. But in visiting such places one need not strain the eyes looking for the spires and domes of a vast metropolis. Cities could not always show one

decent house or twenty log cabins. To reach the *terminus* of a street in a "city" we have had to pass in review the drapery of the population hung out of windows or on clothes-lines zig-zag on the street. But similar drapery may be seen about the palaces of Genova la Superba. When these humble hamlets do really become cities they usually drop the appellation. Denver, when merging from a mining camp into a town, was Denver City. Now that it has become a great railroad centre, with a population of nearly a quarter of a million, the prophetic term has been dropped, and it is simply Denver. Who now speaks of Omaha City or Sacramento City? But we have still Salt Lake City and, for an obvious reason, Kansas City. And under due aspect few places have more right to the title than the Mormon capital. From the first, Zion has had bishops enough, such as they were, to equip half the great cities of Christendom. They were more numerous than any other officials of church or state. And a city, according to an European usage not introduced into the United States, was held to be the seat of a bishop.

In their Scriptural style the early Mormons used to describe their piebald villages as dowered with the beauty of Carmel and the glory of Libanus. Here dwelt Brigham Young, the prophet of the Most High, and hither came multitudes from the ends of the earth "to worship in the place where his feet had trod." Here the glory of the Lord had descended on His chosen one, and the saints exclaimed with enthusiasm: "Our feet have stood in thy courts, O Jerusalem!" Even the physical beauty of the shabby little town was extolled, and, in the glory of her vineyards and cornfields, she was likened to "a bride going forth to meet her beloved." Much of the beauty and freshness ascribed to Zion and its environs was doubtless due to the contrast with the territory through which they were reached. Pleasant was the refreshing greenery of the holy city to the wayfarer who had just passed through prairies interminable, where the sun goes down, as he sinks at sea—a dreary, treeless, rainless expanse, where every species of growth is spinous, a desolate alkali desert, a blighted arid land, on which one might fancy "the Lord had rained fire and brimstone out of heaven." Even the spray of the unpoetic garden-hose, which one sees everywhere in Salt Lake City, is grateful after the white dust of the wilderness, which irritates the eyes, throat and nostrils. And the patches of alfalfa, so common throughout Zion, are as squares of earth jeweled with emeralds, after the blinding glare of the white sun on the white ground, or the white moon on the saline plain, where the effervescence of salt resembles frozen sand. Lovely is the pink-limbed peach-tree after the dusty sage-brush which assumes the neutral tint of

the wilderness, where there is no color save in the sky. And cheering are the broad, dusty streets of Zion to pilgrims who have traversed the ocean-like steppes, *Llano Estacado*, where the Indian sets up stakes in the drifting sand to guide him aright through this deserted bed of some prehistoric sea.

It was homelike, too, to see the crowds pouring out of the tabernacle in thousands of a Sunday evening when one had been familiar with the Indians draped in bright-colored blankets. These they wear as gracefully as a Roman might wear his toga. But their matted hair and greasy faces are rather repulsive to the dainty Caucasian. The sleek, fat cows behind Brother Brigham's corrals were a pleasanter, if less romantic, sight than the fleet antelope skipping over the gray savannahs. Even the low, squat houses of pre-Gentile days, every chimney of which represented a separate family, looked fair and cosy after the white tents and camp-fires of the wilderness. And how restful to the eye were the green grass and the golden corn when one had come through bald, bare cañons or over the Rockies, so desolate in their grandeur—some hoary, weird, grotesque, framing their great heads in the sky; others covered with aspen, beech and pine; their tints contrasting with the brown and gray of the heavy granite boulder and the pale brightness of the milky quartz!

When Brigham led his followers into the Happy Valley, they were, indeed, separated from the whole world, and completely at the mercy of this despot. Gigantic peaks stood as sentinels over the sacred city. Tremendous as were the difficulties of getting out, they were purposely exaggerated. The knowledge that every avenue of escape was closed exerted a powerful influence in forcing them to abide by their fate. By law or otherwise, there was, practically, no redress: "Who entered here left hope behind." Surrounded by barriers almost impassable, of desert and mountain, Utah, and especially the holy city, formed the last and securest stronghold of the Mormon exodus. *L'Etat c'est moi!* The temporal governor and spiritual ruler, Young, an irresponsible despot, was prophet, high priest, and anointed king, whose counsellors might advise, but must not presume to direct him. To strengthen the hands of the Church—*i.e.*, himself—missionaries who would compass sea and land for a proselyte, were sent to the heathen—*i.e.*, every one not a "Saint." Mormon membership is recruited from all religions save the Catholic. Rank and file, who worked under the *ægis* of the Beehive, the Mormon escutcheon, emblem of the industry Young pretended to deify, were mostly ignorant dupes. The best thing this "Prophet, Seer, and Revelator" did was to preach the gospel of work. So far as he could achieve it, the men and women of the Beehive earned their bread in the sweat



f their brow. "No drones in this hive," was his text for many a discourse. "It is a fixed law," said he, "that every man, with few exceptions, is intended to live on his own earnings. No man has a right to eat his daily bread without producing as much in the scale of life as he consumes, and that, too, by some kind of honest physical labor." His disciples mostly became farmers, or laborers, or wrought at mechanical trades, or entered into mercantile business. The richer they became, the more they enriched him. When he purchased property, he graciously allowed them to pay for it, but held it in his own name. As trustee-in-trust, all moneys of the Church passed through his hands. He continued to add house to house, field to field, mine to mine, and to increase his investments and bank deposits till he became a millionaire many times over, as well as absolutism personified.

From the first, the Latter-day Saints, whether east of the Missouri or in the "Valley of Ephraim," were antagonistic to every form of government save their own miserable caricature of a theocracy. The credulous Mormon was taught that his church would overthrow the government at Washington, assume control of the republic, and finally possess the earth. This monstrous ambition created a civil war in Missouri, and excited the people of Illinois to drive the Saints by force of arms from their borders. Hence, the retreat to Utah, "a thousand miles from everywhere." Here, secure from all interference from the outside world, the arch-Mormon gathered in disciples who brought him the mammon of iniquity, and, in still larger numbers, those who carried neither purse nor scrip. The chiefs, who were a law unto themselves, "counselled"—a "counsel" being the strongest kind of command—the Saints "to be ready to carry fire and sword to the very gates of the capital. However wild in theory and impossible in practice their designs were, the leaders were ready to sacrifice the rabble for their achievement. Though mostly Americans by birth, the controlling powers never regarded themselves as such, but as citizens of Zion. Full of bombast and hypocrisy, they were chronic rebels to the flag that protected them. When the great Civil War broke out, no Mormon handled a musket on either side. President Young, Czar of all the Mormons, spoke the sentiments of his associates and dupes when he said: "The North prays for the destruction of the South, and the South prays for the destruction of the North, and I say 'Amen' to both prayers."

Often did he point a moral with that Titanic struggle. And not a few of his satellites hoped that the Mormon Church, whose comparative insignificance they knew not, would one day march to victory over the mutilated remains of both armies. To be at variance with the government seemed essential to their status as Mormons.



Brigham Young,<sup>1</sup> undoubtedly, possessed many of the qualities of a great ruler. His suave, plausible manners endeared him to the people, who certainly cherished his memory more than that of any other leader. He would walk about among the laborers on the roadside, descend from his carriage to inquire about a sick brother, shake hands affectionately with some small farmer, and effusively, with eyes and hands lifted heavenward, invoke the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob on the admiring bystanders. We have never heard a Mormon speak against Brother Brigham. More than one hapless woman who spoke with loathing of the horror of polygamy, placed him above the divine law: "He can do what he pleases; whatever he does is right." Others bear the wretchedness of their forlorn lives as the heaven-appointed cross destined to win an eternal crown. Their faith in Mormon fanaticism seemed unshaken, and they accept their bitter lot with sad resignation. But since the incoming of the gentiles many shake off the degrading yoke.

From the first, polygamy, though indignantly repudiated by the leaders, was a characteristic of this latest phase of Protestantism. The founders and higher officials—Smith, Young, Kimble, Grant, Taylor, Wells, all Americans of English lineage—were, with one exception, polygamists. In early days this was carefully concealed from the outer world; later, it became their boast. All were consummate hypocrites, ready, when the so-called good of the church required, to assert unblushingly what they knew to be false. Truth, honor, honesty, were unknown qualities among them.

The polygamous feature of this fanaticism attracted much attention from the fact of its bearing so heavily on women. Mormons married two or three sisters at once, and occasionally a mother and her daughter, and even granddaughter. Brigham Young married the sisters Clara and Lucy Decker. His daughters, Fanny and Luna, married George Thatcher; Mary and Caroline, Mark Croxson; Alice and Emily, Hiram Clawson. On these points there was no law save the will of the Prophet. And what God had joined together in lawful wedlock—or not joined, as in case of unlawful marriages—he was willing to put asunder for a consideration of ten dollars the ordinary divorce fee. Money made in this way he declared he gave to his consorts for pin-money, but it was well known that it never got nearer to those poor sultanas than his own pocket.

<sup>1</sup> Brigham Young has been called a psychological freak. His parents were ordinary, his children scarcely average, and not one of his ten brothers or sisters showed any talent whatever. He was a man of splendid appearance; the carriage of his massive head was majestic; he was considerably above middle height, and in his costume wore combinations which would suggest the ridiculous on any one else. But we have never heard of any one daring to laugh at this terrible despot.

He did, however, allow them the windfalls of his blooming orchards, by which they made a pittance in a region remarkable for its fine peaches and apples. Save in the secret archives of the Endowment House, where the occult ordinances of Mormonism took place, no record of marriages was kept. Passing over the "wives" of earlier years, the nineteen women who lived under the roof of the Prophet and ate his bread in the sixties and seventies, derived no social distinction, even in the holy city, from being espoused to the Protestant Sultan. Except the favorite, usually the lady on whom his High Mightiness had bestowed the latest reversion of his hand, all were merely servants without wages—cooks, housemaids, care-takers, laundresses, teachers for the ever-increasing progeny, who did the work and kept everything clean and orderly about the premises. Their wants were frugally supplied; necessities, but no luxuries, were seen in their tidy quarters at the Lion House or the Beehive, which were connected by a row of neat offices. The Beehive is a large white house with a gilded beehive on the top. The portico of the Lion House is decorated with a sculptured lion. The Lion house was his official residence. In the Beehive most of the consorts and their children lived. Seventeen of these degraded women were Americans who were continually boasting of their Anglo-Saxon descent; one was a German, and one an English woman who proposed for the Prophet, offering, like Jacob, conditions reversed, to serve seven years for him. She did work for him for that space, and received the coveted prize. Their son was greatly petted by Brigham, who used to call him: "My English boy." The favorite of the moment ruled the capricious tyrant with a rod of iron. No "plural wife" ever held this precarious post so long as Amelia Folsom, a Massachusetts woman, on whom he bestowed the seventeenth nuptial ring he distributed. Among the sights of Zion, in the midst of a spacious lawn, is the elegant mansion he built her, called the Amelia Palace, in which he died. It perpetuates the memory of their unholy connection in the city that witnessed their sin, but, unhappily, not their repentance.

## II.

When we conjure up a vision of Catholic women as we remember them in the long ago—maidens with the innocence of children, matrons with the modesty of maids—we have sometimes wondered if they ever thanked God that they had never seen, nor, indeed, could they imagine, the awful miseries of their sister women in the Mormon valley—*hac lacrymarum valle*—which nature has made so fair. Looking at the hard, disagreeable, ugly faces of the Mormon women who met us at every turn in the City of the Blest, we recalled the sweet, patient, holy countenances grouped about us in

childhood—the matron about whose lineaments lingered the glow of virginity, and the maid through whose bright eyes looked an angelic soul. Whence the difference, yea, the contrast, between woman and woman, maiden and maiden? Ah it is due to faith and virtue. The Catholic belongs to a Church that teaches all holiness. In the Mormon women virtue is in abeyance, if not annihilated; vice in the guise of religion usurps its place, and sometimes its hideousness shows even in “the human face divine.”

A Catholic friend who has lived many years in Utah writes: “I took the census of 4000 souls, four-fifths of whom were Mormons. I found two married women of English birth whose parents were Catholics. They had left England in early girlhood. Both were illiterate, had received no instruction as Catholics, and were Mormons, not from any belief in the doctrines of Joe Smith or Brigham Young, but on account of the earthly paradise promised them in Zion. Another woman had been baptized a Catholic, she did not know where. I asked if the Mormons were good to her. She said ‘yes.’ I asked in what this goodness consisted, ‘They let me live there,’ she replied, pointing to a mud hovel on the roadside.”

God be praised! Catholic women never accepted the “celestial exaltation” which women are declared to receive by becoming “plural wives” of Mormon elders. The women of the Beehive are English, Scotch, Welsh, German, Scandinavian, American. The Irish, who may be considered the representative English-speaking Catholics, have been conspicuous only by their absence. Years ago, Henry Ward Beecher, who had little sympathy with the Irish race, and less with the Catholic religion, in lecturing on his “Circuit of the Continent,” gave utterance to the following remarkable words when describing his sojourn in Salt Lake City: “Be it said to the credit of the Irish race, that I have not found a single Irishman or woman in the whole Mormon system. Whether this is due to the teachings of the great Roman religion, or to some inherent virtue in the people, I cannot say, but such is the fact.”

To a considerable extent the Mormon women were “gathered in” from the lower strata of womanhood in non-Catholic countries, and were the offscouring of all. But many women of education (so-called), of wealth and social standing, have been inveigled into this monstrous and pernicious superstition. One of them, who, unasked, gave the writer much information about these peculiar creatures, said: “If it were known that I told you all this it would get me into great difficulty with our people.” They were captivated by the rude eloquence of bishops, elders, and the “quorum of the seventies,” who preached, in words of striking sound and little meaning, the glory and fulness of the everlasting

gospel, the gifts and graces of the spirit, sedulously concealing the doctrines of polygamy, and blood atonement, and every other repulsive feature of this crude fanaticism.

No wonder that unspeakable wretchedness of body and mind have absorbed from female faces among "the Saints" all beauty and comeliness, and wrought in them the hard look that unsanctified suffering produces. The degraded creatures from whom womanly dignity, sweet refinement, and sustaining self-respect had vanished, and in whose souls the discordant elements of malice, hatred and strife had made their abode, were the slaves, rather than the toys, of capricious tyrants whose boorishness was the least of their foibles.

In Salt Lake City and throughout Utah, the writer was struck with the preternatural ugliness of the women. Issuing from the Tabernacle, squatting on their doorsteps, or lounging about the gates of their dwellings, one could note the hard, wizened features, the defiant, repulsive expression. Having mentioned this all-pervading absence of personal comeliness to friends who rather doubted that it existed to such a remarkable extent, and remembering that tastes differ, we sought other evidence as to the personal appearance of these people. To the query: "How do you find Mormon women as to looks?" an Irish gentleman who has lived many years in Utah, replied: "Decidedly ugly, and this ugliness is more marked throughout the Territory than in the capital. The cast of features is more than plain." Domestic unhappiness and social degradation have furrowed the features and drawn hard lines about the eyes and mouth, making the faces grim and repulsive. We inquired of Gentile visitors, and found that they were impressed as we were. Justin McCarthy speaks of the faces of Mormon women as "dispirited, depressed, shapeless, hopeless, soulless." Indeed, visitors to the Valley of the Saints have been all but unanimous on this subject. Ann Eliza Webb, a Mormon from her birth, and a so-called wife of Brigham, admits the ugliness of the women, but says: "They are pretty enough as children. When the curse of polygamy is forced upon them, they grow hard, or die in their struggles to become inured to this unnatural life."

The Mormons have attracted attention and created excitement out of all proportion to their numerical insignificance. In Utah they are far below 200,000. Many apostatize, but their places are filled by disciples allured by Mormon propagandists in all parts of the globe. The fanatical energy of the governing elders has not slackened. They have publicly renounced polygamy, but "plural wives" now appear as nurses or servants, and the law reaches but few of the wily transgressors.

In 1850 President Filmore appointed Brigham Young governor in 1854 another governor was sent out, but Brigham would not be replaced. "I am, and shall be, Governor of Utah," said he, "no power shall remove me till the Almighty says, 'Brigham don't want you in this post any longer.'" He kept his word. At the time of his death, 1877, he broke every power sent to break him, and was, *de facto*, supreme ruler to the last. For thirty-three years this *Mokanna* may be said to have nominated every officer in Utah. He was president of the "Saints," and all legislative, executive and judicial offices were in his gift. In no instance did the people vote, save as "counselled." Many acts of the legislature were passed simply to convey valuable property to Young, at once to the grantee and the governor, whose approval was necessary to the validity of the grant. Nor did this state of things die with the terrible high priest. As late as 1882 the Legislative Assembly consisted of thirty-six members, all Mormons. They met to do the bidding of their chiefs, the United States paying their mileage and *per diem* salaries. It was the aim of the leaders to form a separate independent State, an empire within an empire, destined to crush all other governments and to inherit the earth. They ruled Utah, held the balance of power in Idaho, and wielded a potent influence in Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nevada. They declared themselves, like the Israelites in Egypt, aliens in the land that bore them. The alienism that began with Joe Smith over sixty years ago, has descended from sire to son into this decade of the nineteenth century. Hence, Gentiles have contended that Mormons should be denied the privilege of voting so long as their fealty is not given to the Washington government, that "the political fangs of Mormonism should be extracted" by the withdrawal of franchise. In public the "Saints" affect the deepest reverence for the laws. But their works agree not with their words. Instead of bringing offenders to justice, they screen them from the officers of the law, and when refractory citizens are tried and punished, they pose as martyrs rather than transgressors.

Federal officers who entered the territory when Brigham Young was king, were traduced and persecuted unless they were as wax in his hands. When, in 1870, he conferred the franchise on women, he was hailed by advanced female suffragists as a liberal, high-minded ruler. But this made elections a greater farce than ever. Every woman voted as her husband dictated, and every man voted except as "counselled." To increase the voters so as to entitle Utah to be admitted into the Union as a State, Mormon leaders resorted to the most unscrupulous measures. It was judicious to provide against a contingency that might arise should Mormon and Gentile votes result in a tie, were men the or

oters. Such a calamity could now be easily averted. The poor Gentile went to the polls with one, or at most, two votes. The Mormon drove up triumphantly with wagons full of wives and children, every one, even the babe in arms, having a vote to deposit. Suffrage became the veriest sham. One of Brigham's consorts says that when ordered to vote she begged to be excused, as she knew nothing of the candidates; but her lord sternly bade her go to the polls, naming his coachman as her political instructor. She never learned the name of the person for whom she voted, but suspected it was for that "calamity of his time," George Q. Cannon, an Englishman, high in office, who more than once had been a convicted criminal. Swedes and Norwegians who could not speak a word of English voted according to the "counsel" of the elders, without the formality of naturalization. Dead "Saints" voted by the proxy of the living. More than we commonly understand by "the quick and the dead" were represented on petitions sent to Congress. Men were known to "christen" their beasts of burden, give them names and surnames, and make them sign or vote—by proxy.

The Prophet was a declared enemy to education, but when the establishment of schools became compulsory, he was equal to the occasion. The school system became, practically, a scheme to direct Mormon meeting-houses at public expense. In these were taught all the abominations of the sect. And as Catholics are often taxed for schools they cannot conscientiously use, so the Gentiles in Utah were forced to support the Mormon system, while maintaining separate schools for their own children. Our modern Mahomet often declared that he would never give a dollar to educate another man's child, that education is a foe to labor, and puts children in danger of becoming "loafers and horse-thieves"; perils to which he exposed his own progeny, some of which he sent to Gentile colleges. But, he was a law unto himself, or above all law. His descendants used to boast of their royal lineage, and take liberties on account of it. There was an absurd story, devoutly believed in the New Jerusalem, of a travelling scion of the House of Young, who refused to give the *pas*, in Hyde Park, to a son of Queen Victoria; and the genuine princes who visited Utah were regarded as offshoots of the effete royalties of Europe, and infinitely inferior to the vigorous sons of Brigham, which, from a physical standpoint, they probably were and are.

As will be readily conjectured, nothing was done to keep the children of the Rocky Mountain "Saints" clean of heart. How could purity be thought of amid such base environments? But to attach them to the Mormon Church and polity, every effort was used, and in the most effective manner. Many immeasurably higher in the scale of morality might take lessons from the value



"The Saints" set on early impressions and associations. It was well said: "Give me the child for the first seven years and do with you will with him afterwards." The future of Mormon childhood is overshadowed by early associations to a greater extent than a one unacquainted with their peculiar ways could imagine. They are indoctrinated with Mormon tenets, taught to exalt their own and despise every other "persuasion." Intercourse with Gentiles was forbidden as contamination.

Some one said that if a man were permitted to make the laws of a nation, he need not care who made its laws. The ballads of Utah engraved in the tender hearts of children the pernicious principles of a disgraceful sect. Doggerel, dignified by the name of poetry, striking couplets, sharp epigrams, were committed to memory, or sung from the church hymn-books, by the camp-fire on plains glittering with salt crystals, within the bare walls of the huge, ugly tabernacle, on the school-bench by day, and under the roof-tree at night. The Deity was thanked for having mercifully brought the choristers into the bosom of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, and taught them a faith, whereby they were to be savingly converted. Some were sung to bold defiant airs, with staccato movement; some to music appealing and sonorous; some to easy negro melodies. Brigham's favorite air was "General Annie." The singers were "the chosen few," whose mission was to build up the waste places of Zion, and make the desert blossom like the rose. They sang the glories of the promised land, the city of refuge, where "the Saints" were beyond the reach of their enemies, with none to molest them.

Catholics who were formerly Mormons, have often expatiated on the extreme difficulty of shaking off their early impressions. Nor could they readily forget the coarse rhymes in which their earlier creed was enshrined. Snatches of these were often unconsciously warbled, even by some who had learned the glories of "Porta manes et stella maris" of the Universal Church.

Some effusions sung in the tabernacle could not be quoted here. Absurd, utterly worthless, beneath criticism, as most of them are, they always crystallize Mormon tenets. If the more intelligent Mormon could despise the angry denunciations of cunning elders, and rid himself of early associations, the greatest obstacles to his conversion would be removed. But under a system of utter submission to a despot, freedom was annihilated. The people, irreversibly styled in non-Catholic phraseology "the masses," were "dumb, driven cattle," and rarely had any one the spirit to "be a hero in the strife." "To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly." A recalcitrant member who after the first or second admonition refused to submit to the great Moslem, soon "disappeared," and his place knew him no more.

## III.

In August, 1866, Father Kelly, of Grass Valley, was made pastor of Salt Lake City by Right Rev. Eugene O'Connell, to whom the Holy See confided Utah Territory in 1865. Father Kelly bought the ground on which the little cathedral now stands. In 1868 a Catholic bishop visited Zion for the first time, and said mass at the residence of Judge Marshall, whose guest he remained for a fortnight. Among the names of the first Catholics are O'Reilly, Barron, Byrne, Kennelly, Vaughan, Dahler and Simpkins.

Father Foley succeeded Father Kelly, and early in 1871 opened a subscription list for the erection of a church. Though few, and mostly poor, Catholics were so generous that the church was finished in a few months and dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen, November 26, 1871. In 1873 Rev. Lawrence Scanlon devoted his energies to the spread of the true faith in Salt Lake Valley; in 1887 he became Vicar Apostolic, and later bishop of the holy city. Under the able administration of this zealous prelate religion has made rapid strides. The church in which the sacred mysteries have been celebrated for a score of years is now too small for the constantly-increasing congregation, and zealous Catholics hope that the spires of a splendid cathedral will soon overlook this New Jerusalem.

More quickly than any other means would the spread of Catholic doctrine destroy this new Islamism, and hence Young would never have allowed the Church to gain a foothold had he been able to keep it out. The establishing of soldiers, many of whom were Irish Catholics, at Fort Douglas, on a plateau above the city, and the immense number of miners, smelters, stokers of the same religion and nationality that flocked to Zion after the opening of the railroads, in 1869, made it impossible for him to keep it out. The first priests were persecuted at his instigation. A coffin was sent to Father Kelly, with an intimation that he would soon be put in a state to occupy it. He boldly complained to the Prophet, who denied all knowledge of an outrage perpetrated by his orders, and declared himself the protector of Catholics. This adaptable ruler ever after professed strong friendship for the priest, and often said: "If Father Kelly had stayed long enough and tried hard enough he might have made a Catholic of me; but I tried my best to make a Mormon of him without a shadow of success." Young and other Mormon lights showed much esteem for Catholics. A high official said to the writer: "We all like the Catholics. They do not annoy or persecute us; they treat us like gentlemen." If Catholics spoke of the peculiar institution, they felt that it is only Catholics who could do so with authority. For they saw



little difference between their own system and the progress of polygamy practiced wherever divorce holds sway. Some of Young's descendants have renounced polygamy, and a few have become Catholics. A grandson of his was elected city marshal of Zion on the Liberal ticket. During the campaign he spoke of his people as misled and benighted, and never alluded to his Mormon pedigree. Several intelligent Mormons say that it is useless to uphold their doctrines against the sea of enlightenment which emigration is flooding Utah, which has grown quite commonplace, and is no longer the Western Wonderland. Grand streets, castle-like edifices, gas, electric lights and other modern improvements brought in by the Gentiles—who quickly employed the exchequer, and were even so fashionable as to go in debt—have quite changed the aspect of the rural village, with dirt streets, adobe or frame cottages, embowering shrubbery, and long runnels like those of old Berne,—the holy city of Brigham to-day. In a Christian aspect, things are brighter to-day than they have yet been in the stronghold of the "Saints." It has been proclaimed, and in no uncertain tones, that the Mormons must conform to the law or cease to exist as a body. This would, in one fell swoop, destroy the most debasing feature—polygamy. Loyal subjects will not stand on the same plane with fanatics who assume to have a mission to uproot every government. The Republic Brigham made them slaves; the Catholic Church shows them the blessed "freedom wherewith Christ has made us free." The Catholics now outnumber the Mormons, and recent victories show that Utah is at last a fit abode for the brave and the free. The decision of Judge Anderson, in refusing to admit to citizenship men bound by the horrible oaths of the Endowment House, embodies an impartial epitome of Mormon subterfuge and treachery. This fanaticism dies hard; it has not only nine, but nine hundred lives.

The incoming of non-Mormons has not done all that optimists expected; nevertheless, its effects are felt. Even fashion has contributed to wound this moral cancer in the breast of the nation. It costs money to dress fashionably, and "plural wives" are always content to be servants without wages. Even in the Valley of the Blest, women will assert themselves, and "Saints" copy styles from their Gentile sisters. The cotton gowns and sun-bonnet of early days, and the hideous "Deseret costume" of linsey-woolsey antelope hide, designed by the Prophet for the women of the Latter-day hive, could no more be revived to-day than could the laws and usages of the Saxon Heptarchy.

A great work has been begun in Utah by Catholic agencies and Ecclesiastics, with their helpers, in exemplifying the purity

rectity of Catholic teachings, before men steeped in every domination, have caused many a sinner to say, as did St. Augustine, when he considered the virtues of the genuine Saints: "Cannot I do what these have done?" When Mormons enter the Church, their allegiance is transferred from the Sultan of Zion to the President of the United States, and they cannot be good Catholics without being good citizens.

Suffrage, the acknowledged palladium of the freeman's liberty, is free, and Gentiles have been voted into office in Utah. The law, sustained by a healthy public opinion, is doing away with the more odious features of this abhorred system. But among the determining causes which will destroy this moral leprosy, grafted on sensual, avaricious men on a false religion, the most powerful is the spread of Catholic principles. Where woman was most degraded, woman must reign a queen—the Woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and the stars of heaven for her apparel. Mary, the purest of Virgins, will sanctify the fertile vales and blooming gardens of Utah. The great Mother of Mercy will look lovingly on these poor children of fanaticism, and her glance creates purity.

In 1870 Brigham Young invited the Sisters of Mercy to his city, and when these Sisters visited him he showed them every courtesy. He used to say, that he had never met his superior, and there was no one on earth to whom he would raise his hat. He refused this courtesy to royalties visiting his capital. "The master should hang his hat on the peg the Almighty made for it—his head, of course," said Bishop Kimball, one of his sycophantic admirers. But he did doff his hat to the Sisters, gave them, unasked, twenty dollars for their charities, and showed them in their carriage with extreme politeness. He invited other Sisters to come to him whenever they needed spiritual advice and direction! In 1875, when Sisters came to stay, Mormon children went to meet them in great crowds, but were soon "counselled" to leave, the Mormon oligarchy being convinced that children educated in convent could never become good Mormons.

Brigham died August 29, 1877, being as old as the century. One of his daughters said, his last words were, "Joseph! Joseph!" His disciples understood that he called on Joe Smith, who had led him into Mormonism, either in reverence or in reproach. Some Catholics, to whom he had shown courtesy, hoped against hope, that he was calling on St. Joseph! A grandson of his declared, that he said, just before he died, "I never had a wife but one, and that was my first."

Like Joe Smith, he was a persistent violator of the ten commandments. If his hand did no murder, murders were done at

his instigation by a secret society sworn to do his will, the Da Avenging Angels, or Destroying Angels. A profound hypocrisies an able politician, as leader of the Saints for thirty-three years showed much executive ability. Most of his children were and preceded him to the tomb. In early times, he would not take his disciples medical aid, but undertook to cure the sick by laying on of hands. When ill himself, however, he always had many physicians as could be got. He left nineteen widows and about thirty children. His millions were divided among his families. No restitution was made to those whom he had robbed, cheated, and, as far as we could ascertain on the spot, he died where he had lived. His grave, in a large green near his old dwelling behind the Eagle Gate, is one of the sights of Zion. Several of his consorts are buried beside him, an honor which will be accorded to any among the rest who may die without contracting another marriage.<sup>1</sup>

Brigham Young told the Sisters of Mercy who visited the city when he was in the zenith of his power and fame, that he heartily wished and earnestly tried to induce an Irish colony to join the Saints in Utah; and he boasted that whatever he set his heart on he accomplished. An Irish colony came, but not in the guise he had hoped for. The bishop and most of the clergy who are religious are of that nationality—the zealous clergy who have erected schools, churches, and hospitals, and the dark-skinned daughters of the faith, who gather in the little ones of Christ as the lightning-rods of Utah to turn the divine vengeance from the people. These are chief among the causes which will deter the gradual, if not rapid, overthrow of this latest development of the Reformation. Disciples will be attracted to the true faith seeing in the children of the Church illustrations of the same which Mary fosters in those who love her. God, Himself, by His omnipotent grace, will work, sweetly and peaceably, this “change of the right hand of the Most High.” The deluded victims of the vicious system will become “the clean of heart,” destined to see God, and pronounced “blessed” by the mouth of the Word incarnate. “O, how beautiful is the chaste generation in glory whose memory thereof is immortal.”

M. A.

<sup>1</sup> Both as a prophet, and as Thaumaturgus, the enterprising Brigham was very fortunate. But the credulity of the Salt Lakers was inexhaustible. When he said, “Do you believe that I know what is coming? That I can work this miracle?” the answer was an enthusiastic “Yes.” Once, Joe Smith said he would walk across a river; but he paused on the brink, and asked his followers, “Do you believe I can do what I say?” They replied in the affirmative. “Well, then,” said he, “is the same as if I had done it!” an answer which did not shake the implicit faith of the advanced or the neophytes in the founder of Mormonism.

# OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

EARLY Christian art being essentially symbolical, continued and purified the traditions of ancient art: for Symbolism was the original characteristic of all religious teaching, whether true or false, and, except among the Hebrews, religious teaching was largely conveyed by visible delineations. Clement of Alexandria, in the third century, said in his "Stromata," or Miscellanies, in which he was discussing secret teaching, that "All who have treated of divine matters, both Greeks and Barbarians, have veiled the principles of things, and delivered the Truth enigmatically by signs, symbols, and allegories."<sup>1</sup> The same idea is expressed by the great Origen in his answer to Celsus: "That some truths should be conveyed to the public in a less developed manner, is common to Christian doctrine and to the teachings of (profane) philosophy, in which certain things are exoteric and others esoteric."<sup>2</sup>

The principal subject of early Christian art was religious truth, and this could not be conveyed through the senses and in a manner accommodated to the illiterate and the ignorant save in a symbolical way. Such a mode of imparting instruction was sanctioned by our Lord and His apostles. "The parables in the Gospel," say Northcote and Brownlow, "are real pictures, and they are symbolical; they suggest and teach religious truths by means of sights and acts of ordinary life, invested with a spiritual meaning."<sup>3</sup> Saint Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, and in his first to the Corinthians, must also be cited in testimony of this Scriptural symbolism. Before the end of the second century, the celebrated Melito, bishop of Sardis—one of the Seven Churches of Asia<sup>4</sup>—wrote a very curious book, called by Eusebius "The Key," in which the author unfolds the hidden and mystical sense of words and things in the Bible.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Omnes ergo, ut semel dicam, qui de rebus divinis tractarunt, tam barbari, quam Graeci, rerum quidem principia occultaverunt; veritatem autem aenigmatibus, signisque ac symbolis, et allegoriis rursus et metaphoris, et quibusdam talibus tropis minusque tradiderunt."—(Stromatum, lib. v., cap. iv., ed Migne.)

<sup>2</sup> "Caeterum esse quaedam reconditiora nec omnibus relecta id Christianae doctrinae commune est cum philosophia, ubi quaedam exteriora quaedam etiam interiora sunt."—(Lib. i., c. 7.)

<sup>3</sup> *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. ii., p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc., iii., 1.

<sup>5</sup> The whole second volume of the *Spicilegium Solesmense* of the late very learned cardinal Pitra, O.S.B.—whom we count it an honor to have known—is taken up with

In writing of early Christian art we give it the widest range as to include paintings, mosaics, sculptures, bas-reliefs, carvings, ivories, gilded glasses (of which the South Kensington Museum in London, has a rich collection), and bronze and terra-cotta lamps, etc. We present the following as an almost complete cycle of Old Testament subjects, having a fixed traditional form, and constantly repeated, except two or three, which have been found only yet, but rarely: God, the Father; Adam and Eve; Cain and Abel; Noe; Sacrifice of Isaac; the Patriarch Joseph; Moses and the Passage of the Red Sea; Grapes of Nehelescol;<sup>1</sup> Crossing of the River Jordan; David and Goliath; Translation of Elias; Vision of Ezechiel; Daniel in the Lions' Den; Three Children in the Fiery Furnace; Job; Samson; Susanna; Tobias; Jonas. Of some of these will be mentioned by us in any detail. There are many biblical scenes in which an artistic representation, or rather suggestion, of the Eternal Father was required. The pastor of the Church under whose direction the artists carried out their signs, never, during the first four centuries, indicated the power and intervention of God, who is a pure spirit and known only by His works, except by a Hand issuing out of a cloud or projecting from above. This symbol is evidently derived from the language of the Psalms, Exodus, and Isaias, where the word signifying hand is used to indicate the action of the Omnipotent. Thus Moses receives the Tables of the Law on Mount Sinai; thus, the arm of Abraham is stayed in the imminent sacrifice of Isaac. After the fourth century, when all danger of an anthropomorphic sense was excluded, God is represented seated on a rock, or on a throne, and delivering an armful of grain and a young lamb to Adam and Eve, who stand respectfully before Him. Such a scene describes artistically the doom of our first parents to a life of labour, the man in tilling the soil, the woman in working the fleece. Although this particular occupation is not mentioned in Genesis, yet the traditions of early Christian art—founded upon still earlier and primeval traditions—lived long after the art itself had passed away, for mediæval allusions to digging the earth and spinning wool, as the occupations of our first parents, are very common and survive in this old Scotch couplet—suggesting, also, the original equality of all men:

---

Saint Melito and his works. The Greek original of the *Clavis* is lost, but MSS. extant of a Latin translation; and an edition of it in this language, founded on fewer than eight mediæval manuscripts, was published with numerous and valuable notes by the eminent Benedictine. The attack upon it by Rev. George Salmon Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christian Biography*, vol. iii., is not conclusive.

<sup>1</sup> Numbers, xliii., 24-25.

<sup>2</sup> iii., 16-17.

"When Adam delved and Eve span,  
Quhair war a' the Gentles than?"

The fall of our first parents is a frequent subject in early Christian art. It was treated in several scenes, as the Temptation, the Transgression, the Condemnation, the Expulsion. The figure of the first Adam by whom sin and death entered into the world, recalled to the early Christians the second Adam by whom is grace and life; and the idea is clearly indicated in a bronze medallion described by Buonarrotti in which the Good Shepherd carrying the lost sheep on his shoulders is shown in a compartment just above Adam and Eve, who are eating the forbidden fruit. This may also have been an artistic protest against the impious doctrine of Tatian—who fell away from the Church—denying the repentance and salvation of Adam. The fact that by eating "of the tree of knowledge of good and evil," the eyes of our first parents were opened, and they perceived themselves to be naked, is always denoted in artistic representations of the Fall. They usually stand on either side of the fatal tree, around which the serpent is coiled, and strive to hide their shame, sometimes with their hands alone, sometimes with fig leaves. Our Catholic translators render the *Perisomata* of the Vulgate by "aprons"; and the old English Protestant version made at Geneva in 1557 is commonly called the *Breeches Bible* on account of the ridiculous rendering of Genesis iii., 7. The Expulsion from Eden is represented on a sarcophagus of the Lateran Museum. On a famous old sarcophagus of Milan, described by Allegranza, in the scene of the Expulsion, we see represented a tree for the Paradise from which our parents were expelled, Adam busied in tilling the earth, and Eve *extracting a thorn from her foot*. It is curious to speculate upon what source Saint Bernard derived the idea of connecting Eve with a thorn—was it, perhaps, from the tradition of our seeing some such specimen of early Christian art? In one of his sermons on the Blessed Virgin Mary he says so emphatically: "*Eva spina fuit, Maria rosa exstitit. Eva spina vulnerando, Maria rosa omnium affectus mulcendo. Eva spina infigens omnibus mortem, Maria rosa reddens salutiferam omnibus Sortem.*"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, ii., 17.

<sup>2</sup> The contrast is striking between the sorrowful but noble lines that close our *Paradise Lost*:

"They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,  
Through Eden took their solitary way,"

and the sanguinary ending of the great epic of the Romans—a people, as the apostle wrote "without mercy"—the deliberate killing of a wounded prisoner: *Vitaque cum semitu fugit indignata sub umbras*—and Life, with a sigh, fled into the valley of Death. (*Æneid.*, xii., 952.)

Cain and Abel is a subject found oftener on sculptured sarcophagi than on mural decorations. In bas-reliefs the brothers are represented in the act of offering, the one a sheaf of wheat or a cluster of grapes, the other a lamb to a noble looking personage seated on a throne, and resting his feet on a *suppedaneum* or stool—an attribute given in antiquity only to people of quality—who make with his left hand a gesture of refusing the homage of Cain, and with his right, that of accepting the fealty of Abel. The picture of the younger brother is the earliest figure of the Redeemer in the New Testament. A magnificent mosaic in the sanctuary of the Byzantine Church of *San Vitale*, at Ravenna (A.D. 526), represents one great scene the most illustrious types of the Bloody and the bloody sacrifice to be met with in the Sacred Scriptures, and brings them advisedly together. Above and in the centre is the Divine hand coming down out of heaven, emblem, as we have said, of the omnipotent God. On one side Abel, clad like an antique shepherd in some animal's skin, with a plaid thrown over his left shoulder and sandals on his feet, coming out of a hut, beside which grows a tree, offers a lamb with arms uplifted over the altar. On the other side, Melchisedech, clothed in sacerdotal vestments of white and gold, advances from the portals of a palace to the same richly draped altar, on which is a chalice (of the kind called *ansata*—because two-handed), between two small loaves of bread. Standing at the altar he raises in his hands a larger loaf towards the most mysterious emblem.<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt as to who these personages are, for the names ABEL, MELCHISEDEC are written over their heads. Melchisedech, as the more perfect figure of Jesus Christ, King and Priest, being "likened to the Son of God,"<sup>2</sup> is distinguished by having a circular nimbus about his head. Here we have a beautiful and instructive representation in most vivid colours of two types of the same Mystery manifested two thousand years apart, the sacrifice of the lamb by Abel, prefiguring the death on the cross of the true Lamb of God "who taketh away the sin of the world,"<sup>3</sup> and the offering by Melchisedech, typifying the "cleansation"<sup>4</sup> and Real presence under the form and appearance of bread and wine in the eucharistic Sacrifice of the New Law. The Church has connected the idea and the sense of these types, now realized in that wonderfully ancient prayer of the Canon of the Mass: "Vouchsafe . . . to accept . . . as Thou wert gracious

<sup>1</sup> May we not suppose that by these loaves of different sizes, the artist meant to suggest the Host for the Mass—as we would now say, and the little Hosts for the communion of the faithful?

<sup>2</sup> *Hebrews*, vii., 3.

<sup>3</sup> *John*, i., 29.

<sup>4</sup> *Mal.*, i., 11.



pleased to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, . . . and that which Thy high-priest Melchisedech offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate host."<sup>1</sup>

Noe in the Ark as a symbol of the Church out of which there is no salvation and Noe as a type of humanity redeemed and admitted to the Church through the waters of Baptism, and the Dove carrying the olive branch of peace, a figure of the Holy Spirit that comforteth, are constantly repeated in early Christian art. It is an image of the Church militant in which man wars against the raging elements of Sin and Hell and escapes the anger of God. On the tombs of the faithful, it signified their death in the communion of the Church and is an equivalent of the *In Pace* of Christian inscriptions. Northcote and Brownlow in treating of the history of Noe in the chapter on Biblical Paintings, remark, "Of what an endless variety of compositions is not this subject capable, and how variously has it not been treated in all the schools of modern art? Yet throughout the whole range of the Roman Catacombs we find but one type of it, and that removed as far as possible from historical truth. Instead of a huge ark riding upon the waves and containing eight persons, together with a vast multitude of living animals, we have a single individual almost filling the small box in which he stands, whilst a dove, bearing an olive branch, flies toward him. The occupant of the ark is often a woman or a child, instead of a man; and in one instance at least, on a sarcophagus in the Lateran Museum, the name JULIANE is added, *i.e.*, the name of the deceased on whose grave it was figured."<sup>2</sup> We have an early clue to the right interpretation of this subject in Saint Peter's First Epistle,<sup>3</sup> and some of the Fathers have drawn out the sense in all its circumstances. Thus Saint Cyprian, Saint Ambrose, Saint Maximus of Turin, and Saint Augustine in his *Epist. contra Donatistas vulgo De unit. Eccl.* cap. v. 9 and *Enarrat. in Psalmos.* ciii. Sermo iii., 2. When therefore, we look on this scene we are certain that it was intended to convey in Christian art the doctrine of remission of sins through Baptism, the gifts of heavenly grace from the Holy Spirit,<sup>4</sup> and salvation in the mystical ark of the Church which is the barque of Peter.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Benedict XIV., a pope equally pious as learned, answers the query why is Christ here called a Priest according to the order, not of Aaron, but of Melchisedech? in his treatise *De Sacrificio Missæ*, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Rom. Sott.*, vol. ii., p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> iii., 20-21.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps with special allusion to the Sacrament of Confirmation which was usually given in the early ages immediately after Baptism.

<sup>5</sup> The famous coins of Apamea in Phrygia, first described by the celebrated antiquary Eckhel, in the third volume of his stupendous work *Doctrina Nummorum Vete-*



The late Charles Lenormant has summed up the controversy in his essay on Christian Emblems found on some Numismatical remains of the third century: *Des signes de Christianisme qu'on trouve sur quelques monuments numismatiques du troisieme siècle*.<sup>1</sup> Among all the stirring events in the life of the great patriarch Abraham that one of his faith and his obedience in the sacrifice of his son Isaac, is singled out for constant representation in early Christian art. The typical sense of the offering of Isaac is suggested by Saint Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, xii., 19, and it was always taken as a figure of the sacrifice of the Son of God upon the cross. The much-loved Isaac represented the innocent Saviour as did also (for *Omnis comparatio claudicat*) the substituted "Ram amongst the briars sticking fast by the horns,"<sup>2</sup> which was sacrificed in place of the boy and which Saint Prosper takes for a particular image of our Lord crowned with thorns in his sacred Passion. This episode so often repeated in the catacombs and ancient places of Christian worship was directed to teach the faithful confidence in God's promises, patience in persecution, constancy in suffering, and, as Love is the end of the Law—incomparable gratitude to Him who died that we might live. It was the most popular of all the Old Testament (as the Good Shepherd was of the New Testament) subjects. It is found in painting, sculpture and mosaic, on gilded glass, and engraved on rings and gems and impressed on earthen-ware lamps and utensils. Moses, the Law-giver and Deliverer of the Jews, being so manifest a figure of Christ the Teacher and Redeemer, is frequently reproduced, especially in those scenes and incidents of his career which had a moral and symbolically, a sacramental character. The first scene represents him putting off his shoes from his feet, at the command of the Voice from the burning bush on Horeb.<sup>3</sup> This act was regarded by the Fathers as significant of setting aside all worldly thoughts and cares in approaching the divine Presence, but more especially as typical (say Saints Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen) of the renunciations made in Baptism. When found on Christian tombs it seems to indicate one who died at a mature age and soon after receiving the sacrament of Regeneration. The Passage of the Red Sea was universally accepted as a type of Baptism. Being a subject that requires a larger and longer space to represent it, we more often find it on the front of imposing sarcophagi. Some of the minor details are very touching. Millin (*Midi de la France*

*rum* (Vienna, 1792-1798, 8 vols., 4to.), and enlarged upon by Wiseman in his *Lectures on the Connection Between Science and Revealed Religion*, represent the subject of Noe in the Ark, but in a manner different from and posterior to the earliest Christian representations of the same which therefore were not copied from pagan originals.

<sup>1</sup> P. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Gen., xxii., 13.

<sup>3</sup> Exod., iii., 5.

gives a striking one found at Arles and now in the municipal museum at Aix, which represents the Exodus out of Egypt and the destruction of Pharaoh and his Host, and recalls to our minds the magnificent mural painting in the Vatican designed by Raphael, executed by Giulio Romano, of the defeat of Maxentius and the Triumph of Constantine, first Christian emperor, for its analogy with the overthrow of the Egyptians and the deliverance of the Chosen People. Moses Striking the Rock merits particular mention, for its great popularity as typifying the waters of Baptism and the abundant supply of spiritual grace and strength flowing from the smitten rock—"and the rock was Christ."

In connection with this scene in the life of Moses we often find an extraordinary but not violent or unnatural turn and combination given to it that not only evidences, as a Protestant writer says, "the complete identification of the two revelations in the mind of the early Christians," but confirms artistically, as we insist, the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy, Saint Peter, whom Prudentius calls "the leader of the new Israel," being regarded as the anti-type of Moses. We mean that in some representations there is a marked and evidently an intended resemblance of Moses in the general appearance of his hair and beard and outline of features to the traditional type of the Prince of the Apostles; and in two instances already discovered, the very name *Petrus* is written beside the figure of the Jewish law-giver. A striking confirmation, from an unexpected quarter, of the Moses-Peter type, as already revealed by Roman monuments, was furnished by an ancient and extremely valuable large glass plate found at Podgoritzza, in Dalmatia, a few years ago, and now in the private collection of Mr. A. Basilewsky, at Paris. On it are rudely scratched a number of scenes and figures, all from the Old Testament, except one, the raising of Lazarus, and each explained by a few words of unclassical Latin. Among them is—as we would expect in any such cycle—the Striking of the Rock;<sup>2</sup> but with this remarkable adjunct that the legend in cursive characters beside the man who extends the emblem of power towards the outgushing waters which fall at his feet reads, when cleared of its barbarisms, *Petrus virga percussit, fontes ceperunt currere*—"Peter struck with the Rod, the Streams began to flow."

This *Insigne tazza vitrea figurata*, as De Rossi calls it, was described by the learned archæologist in the *Bullettino* for 1874, p. 153, and again, more fully with an engraving, in that of 1877, p. 77. The taking up of Elias as a type of our Lord's ascension and a figure of the resurrection of the body; also Jonas as a type of

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor., x, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers, xx., 11.

our Lord's rising from the dead on the third day; Job on his dung hill surpassing all the imagination of philosophers about a just man struggling with adversity, and type of a Holier One than he; Tobias catching the fish whose gall banished the Evil Spirit and healed even temporal infirmity, and regarded by the early Christians as a distinct type of Christ, the true *Ichthys*, which gives us the initials of the Greek words, meaning "Jesus Christ the Son of God our Saviour,"<sup>1</sup> and other Old Testament subjects, must be passed over without further notice in this article. As, however, the touching and instructive story of Susanna is reckoned by Protestants an apocryphal addition to the Book of Daniel, it merits more than a passing mention, since the unvarying tradition of the Apostolic See, which always retained it in the Canon of Scripture, receives so strong a confirmation from early Christian art. This subject is found in painting and in sculpture. Susanna was a figure of the Church, the spotless Bride of Christ, persecuted by Jews and Gentiles, older than she in years and gray in sin.<sup>2</sup> Perret has published an allegorical painting of this subject discovered in the catacomb of *San Callisto*, at Rome, in 1845. A lamb which has a collar of pearls around the neck,<sup>3</sup> and the name *Susanna* written over it, stands in an attitude of mingled fear and resolution between two ferocious-looking beasts, two wolves, or, perhaps, and more probably, a wolf and a leopard, which seem about to seize their prey. Over one of these is written *senioris* (for *seniores*) meaning elders, so that the artist by no means intended a mere representation of *any* Christian beset by danger and temptations. "Behold I send you as lambs among wolves,"<sup>4</sup> but some higher and far more general idea.<sup>5</sup> The story of Susanna was more common on the sarcophagi of Southern Gaul than elsewhere. These bas-reliefs represent the two Elders, trees,<sup>6</sup> and the chaste Susanna with a veil or covering on her head. An oft-repeated accessory which Martigny believes to have reference to certain local and insidious attacks on the Church of Gaul in the fourth and fifth cen-

<sup>1</sup> Saint Augustine fully explains this famous acrostic of the Sybilline verses in the *De Civitate Dei*, xvii., 23; Cardinal Wiseman, "Essays," vol. v., in English, and Cardinal Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmense," vol. i., appendix v., in Latin, have given and commented on the famous *Ichthys* Inscription of Autun, while the latter has also compiled all accessible information from ancient and modern sources about the fish-symbol of the early Christians, in the appendix to the third volume of the "Spic. Solesm." "*Ichthys, Sive de Fisce Allegorico et Symbolico*," pp. 499-629.

<sup>2</sup> Saint Hippolytus, A.D. 222-235, *De Susanna*.

<sup>3</sup> May we not see here an allusion to Canticle I., 9: "Thy cheeks are beautiful as the turtle dove's; thy neck as jewels"—words addressed by the spouse to his mystical bride, the Church, of which, as we have said, Susanna was a type.

<sup>4</sup> Luke, x., 3.

<sup>5</sup> Louis Perret, *Les Catacombes de Rome*, vol. i., pl. 78.

<sup>6</sup> "Her husband's orchard," Dan. xiii., 7.

turies, is a serpent entwined about a tree and darting towards a nest of doves in its branches.

In concluding this short article it might not be inappropriate to say a word concerning those now rare but once very common religious picture-books of the Middle Ages, called *Biblia Pauperum*, or Bibles of the Poor, and to which the late and much-lamented De Rossi has twice called attention in his celebrated *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*. In 1863, among the very first numbers of this serial (p. 40), he treats of the "Biblia Pauperum" on occasion of the recent publication of a copy from a fourteenth century manuscript found in the monastery of Saint Florian, near Vienna, and shows that they are the connecting links in the long chain of Christian Art so abruptly broken at the period of the Renaissance. The pictures of the "Biblia Pauperum," which were remotely derived through many secondary but not substantial alterations from the paintings of the catacombs and the sarcophagi of later ages, were copied in sculptures, in wall-paintings, in altar-pieces, and in the exquisite colored windows of mediæval churches. From them we can trace out which of the ancient types of early Christian art were continued, which were modified, and which were finally lost or discarded. In the year 1887 De Rossi returned to the subject in an article on *La Biblia Pauperum e le sue origini antichissime* (p. 56), which ends with a renewed assurance that the remote originals of these curious xylographs are to be found in the frescos of Subterranean Rome and in the marble work of the fourth and fifth centuries; and commenting on the religious and artistic treasures brought away so abundantly to England and other parts of Northern Europe in the seventh century, he connects the *Biblia Pauperum* with the still earlier illuminated manuscripts—*Concordia veteris et novi testamenti*—and these, in their turn, with the remains of primitive Christian Art.

ROBERT SETON.

## GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

HAD the life of Shakespeare been lengthened by a quarter of a century, he would have met many gigantic figures which were worthy of portrayal by his magic pen. The hideously grand period of the Thirty Years' War, that era of crimes which were more horrible than any which had visited earth since the days of pagan antiquity, was prolific of prodigious beings—a kind of moral Centaurs—half brigands and half great men. The heroes of this struggle were portentously original, and some of them, man-eaters and gold-consumers—for instance, Mansfeld, Halbertaedt, and Wallenstein—were sovereignly detestable. Shakespeare would certainly have discerned a fit subject for his pen in Wallenstein; that colossal satrap who would have been more at home in dark and violent Asia than in Europe; that taciturn fighter who was never known to laugh, and whose soldier declared that he communed with demons; that ostensible Catholic who believed only in judicial astrology, and who was neither Christian nor pagan nor human; that inscrutable sphynx and abyss of ambition, who is still as much of an enigma as he was during his life and in his death. And how well the divine William would have depicted him who was, in all probability, the soldier disinterested, as he was certainly the grandest and most religious commander of his day; Tilly, who was a virgin when he died, and had heard two Masses every day of his life. Shakespeare unrolled many panoramas of history, but he never gazed on one so striking as that which began with the campaigns of Tilly and closed with those of Condé and Turenne, and which resulted in the eclipse of the Spanish policy of Charles V. by that of Richelieu and Mazarin. The Thirty Years' War was the real end of the Middle Age, the end of that death agony which began with the crime of Philip the Fair at Anagni, and the consequence of which was to be the dissolution of the political and social organization which the Catholic Church had imposed upon the *Populus Christianus*—the Christian Republic. This war, strongly but penetratingly observes one of the most brilliant writers of modern France, and a judicious polemic, “issued from the cowl which Luther had trampled under his feet, was a deliverance of the world from the conditions in which it had been placed by the Catholic Church and the Christian royalties; and, of course, such a gain warrants its glorification. This war was the Last Judgment, the Valley of Jehosaphat, of the Middle Age; it was the

resurrection of man, who had been suffocated by God for centuries, as though buried in a sepulchre; and at last man rose out of the ruins of God to put himself in the place of God. It was, in fine, a beginning of a realization of the frightful dream of Jean Paul (Richter), which we have seen actuated: 'There is no God; there is no Christ'; with this difference, however, that the souls in the dream of Jean Paul are desolate—eternally desolate—while modern souls are content, happy in their joys of hell."<sup>1</sup> Such a war will ever be interesting to the student of humanity, and its interest increases in presence of those wars which have lately convulsed Europe, and in presence of those changes which have been recently experienced by the states which formed the German empire of the seventeenth century. But in presenting a succinct sketch of the Thirty Years' War, and a few apposite reflections, to the consideration of the curious, we are chiefly actuated by a desire to enable the reader to judge intelligently as to the legitimacy of the claims to apotheosis which many zealous Protestants advanced, a few months ago, on the occasion of the third centennial anniversary of his birth, as enjoyed by Gustavus Adolphus.<sup>2</sup>

The Latin and Germanic races, united for an instant by Charlemagne, separated when that emperor died; the Latin following its destiny in Italy, France, and Spain, while the Germanic retained, together with the imperial crown, about two-thirds of the Carolingian Empire. In the sixteenth century Germany was a federative empire, composed of both hereditary and elective monarchies and of free imperial cities, which were veritable republics. The hereditary monarchies were governed by lay sovereigns, the elective by ecclesiastical princes, generally issued from powerful noble families. Over all these states, and uniting them together, reigned the Holy Roman Emperor, an elective sovereign who was not a lawful emperor until his election was confirmed by the founder of the empire, the Pope; and who, during the three previous centuries, had nearly always been chosen from among the members of the House of Hapsburg. Just as the prince-bishops were elected

<sup>1</sup> Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Les Oeuvres et Les Hommes*, vol. viii., p. 108, Paris, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> The student who desires detailed information concerning the Thirty Years' War should consult the works of Gindely, Ranke, Opel, Hurter, and Schreiber for the Palatine and Danish periods; those of Gfrörer and Droysen for the Swedish period; and those of Bougeant, Barthold, and Koch for the French period. He will also consult with profit the *History of Louis XIII.*, by Levassor; and the *Memoirs of Richelieu*. Valuable aid will be obtained in the biography of Tilly, by Klopp; in that of Wallenstein, by Ranke; in that of Mansfeld, by Villermont; and in that of Turenne, by Ramsay. The *Storia Universale* of Cantù gives probably the most impartial and satisfactory of all the succinct narratives. Among the more voluminous works treating especially of this subject, none can be compared with the *Histoire de La Guerre de Trente Ans*, by Charveriat (Paris, 1878), for erudition, grasp of subject, and historical acumen.

by the cathedral-chapters, so the emperor was chosen by seven electors. Three of these electors were ecclesiastics, the archbishops of Mayence, Cologne, and Treves; and the lay electors were the Count-Palatine, the King of Bohemia, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg.

The so-called Reformation produced in Germany political as well as religious convulsions. When a lay prince became Protestant, no change occurred in the government of his state, since the power continued to be transmitted by way of hereditary right. But when the sovereign was an ecclesiastic, his perversion to Protestantism necessarily entailed a radical modification of the political constitution of his states; for the first act of a priest, when he had discovered the errors of popery, was an abandonment of celibacy, and therefore a transformation of his elective into hereditary principality. A striking instance of the consequences of the apostasy of an ecclesiastical ruler may be discerned in the case of Albert of Brandenburg, a soldier-monk and grand-master of the Teutonic Knights, who became a "reformer," and by seizing the property of his order, laid the foundation of the Protestant kingdom of Prussia. When the pervert was also an imperial elector, the constitution of the empire was affected; for then, since three of the electors had embraced Protestantism, the majority of the electoral college passed to the innovators, and there was the danger of an elevation of a heretic to the imperial throne—an anomaly for which humanity was not prepared, and the actualization of which would have sapped the very foundation of the venerated institution. After thirty years of discord, Germany, exhausted by the wars of Charles V., was desirous of peace, even at the cost of an abandonment of religious controversy. On February 5, 1532, a Diet assembled at Augsburg, and a kind of peace was concluded between the Catholics and Lutherans; the Calvinists, Zwinglians, and other sectarians being excluded, and declared unable to profit by any of the concessions made by the Catholics. Those princes who had adopted the Confession of Augsburg, as well as the Catholic princes and free states, were to enjoy a species of freedom of conscience; that is, they could be either Catholics or Lutherans. The Evangelicals—so termed, after the fashion of *lucus a non lucendo*, because they paid more attention to the Old Testament than to the Gospel—were utterly ignored in this transaction. The Lutheran princes and states were to retain possession of all the ecclesiastical domains which they had stolen before the treaty of Passau in 1552. The reader will observe that liberty of conscience, or what passed for such, was here granted to princes and to the administrators of the free cities; that is, to sovereigns, and not to subjects, of whom there was no thought in the premises.



Each sovereign was to impose on his people whatever religion accorded with his conviction or suited his caprice, in actuation of the detestable and pre-eminently Protestant principle—in reality, a pagan canon—that the master of a country was, of right, master also of that country's religion; *Cujus regio, ejus religio*.<sup>1</sup> The aggrieved subjects, however, had one resource; they could sell their property, and if they were then able to pay for the privilege, they could emigrate. After the Peace of Augsburg, Protestantism made great progress in Germany. Hitherto it had been confined to Saxony, Franconia, and Suabia; but now it penetrated into Westphalia, Bavaria, and the duchy of Austria. Among the princely families, only three remained Catholic; those of Austria, Bavaria, and Juliers-Cleves-Berg. And even these made many concessions to such of their subjects as became Protestants. Even the ecclesiastical princes gave full toleration to their heretical subjects. At the request of the emperor Ferdinand I., in hopes of preventing further apostacies, Pope Pius IV. accorded, in 1564, the use of the chalice to lay communicants in the duchy of Austria. Of course this concession encouraged the demand of others; and Maximilian II. requested Pope Pius V. to sanction the marriage of the clergy. The Pontiff most energetically refused.<sup>2</sup> Such was the condition of Germany in 1612, when Mathias became emperor. Feeling that his advanced age would not allow him to confront satisfactorily the difficulties of his position, Mathias procured the recognition of his cousin, Ferdinand of Styria, as King of Bohemia in 1617, and as king of Hungary in 1618. This action was equivalent to a proclamation that Ferdinand was to be the next emperor; and as that prince was a zealous Catholic, the Protestants anticipated danger for themselves, and resolved to forestall it. An occasion for action was furnished by a prohibition to erect Protestant temples in his domains, issued by the archbishop of Prague, in accordance with that very Protestant maxim that each ruler should be the guide of his people in religious matters. Led by Count Mathias of Thurn, the Protestants of Bohemia arose in revolt; and the "defenestration" of Prague—the pitching of several royal councillors out of a window, sixty feet from the ground,

<sup>1</sup> This principle was promulgated by nearly all the Protestant juriconsults of that day. The celebrated Hugo Grotius contended: "In arbitrio est summi imperii quænam religio publice exerceatur; idque præcipuum inter majestatis jura ponunt omnes qui politica scripserunt." Certainly this was the most complete of tyrannies, if applied in the fulness of its consequences, and not restrained by the written constitutions which men were obliged to devise as makeshifts, when they had abolished the supreme guardian of justice and of right.

<sup>2</sup> Pfister, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. vii., p. 463; Ranke, *Zur Deutschen Geschichte*, p. 25; Barre, *Histoire d'Allemagne*, vol. ix., p. 90.



so that blood might not be shed in the council-chamber—was a signal for the Thirty Years' War.

The first period of this war, or series of wars, is generally styled the Palatine Period, because of the prominent part taken in it by the Elector-Palatine Frederick V., a weak and yet ambitious prince, whom the Bohemian rebels acclaimed as their king; and who was recommended to their appreciation by his triple position of head of the Protestant League, nephew of the stadtholder of Holland, and son-in-law of the royal theologian, James I. of England. In the ensuing contest, Ferdinand was succored by the Duke of Bavaria, a zealous Catholic; and by the elector of Saxony, a Lutheran, but therefore an enemy of the Calvinists, who were the mainstay of the early rebels. The Palatine was conquered; the destruction of Calvinism was complete; but although the emperor triumphed, he excited the ire of the Lutherans by occupying the palatinate, and above all, by conferring the electoral dignity on a Catholic prince. The Palatine, because of his revolt and usurpation, had undoubtedly merited to be placed under the ban of the empire, and had certainly forfeited his estates; but the emperor should have disposed of the electoral dignity without the concurrence of the electoral college. This seizure of the hereditary states of the Palatine, and the transfer of the electorate to the Bavarian, became the chief pretexts for the continuance of the war; for although the electors ratified the Bavarian's elevation to their circle, their action was more or less compulsory.

During this first period of the war, which lasted from 1618 to 1623, England and Holland gave some aid to the Palatine; Spain naturally supported Austria, for their crowns were worn by royal kinsmen, and their interests were supposed to be identical; France was neutral, but was then more favorable to the Hapsburgs than to their adversaries. When the Palatine period of the war terminated with an apparent triumph of the emperor and of Catholicism, the Protestants everywhere took the alarm; and German Calvinists especially feared for the tenure of the dominions and estates which they had stolen from Catholic ecclesiastics. They renewed the contest; and the Danish monarch, who also coveted the glory of the Church, placed himself at their head, incited and supported by France and England. But like the Palatine, the Dane was beaten; and although the Treaty of Lubeck restored to him his hereditary dominions, he was forced to abandon his German allies. The emperor, foreseeing no obstacles, now published, on March 6, 1629, his famous Edict of Restitution. As we have observed, the Peace of Augsburg, in 1555, had allowed the Lutherans to retain the ecclesiastical domains and properties which they had "annexed" before the Peace of Passau, in 1552. But w

sanctioning these usurpations, the Peace of Augsburg had pronounced that thereafter when a bishop, abbot, or beneficed clergyman apostatized, he should, by the fact, lose his bishopric, abbey, or benefice; and this clause was called the "ecclesiastical reservation." However, in spite of this reservation, the usurpations had continued; and the ecclesiastical princes often called upon the emperor to enforce its observation. The immediate successors of Ferdinand I., not very hostile to Protestantism, had paid no attention to these demands; but things changed with the advent of Ferdinand II., and by the Edict of Restitution the Protestants were forced to restore the domains of two archbishoprics, Magdeburg and Bremen, and of twelve bishoprics, to say nothing of an immense number of exspoliated abbeys and convents. In Saxony alone, the reformers were obliged to relinquish their sacrilegious grasp on 120 abbeys and convents, besides many houses of mendicant friars.<sup>1</sup> This measure, so irritating to hundreds of Protestant nobles and upstarts who had begun to assume some prominence, owing to their acquisition of the goods of the sanctuary, was destined to figure among the pretexts alleged by Gustavus Adolphus in justification of his interference in German affairs.<sup>2</sup> It is painful to have to notice, in this connection, that a large number of these recovered properties, instead of being restored to their rightful owners, or of being used for religious or educational purposes, fell into the hands of Catholic laymen; and in 1632 Pope Urban VIII. declared that the torments inflicted on Germany by the Swedes were in punishment of this scandal.<sup>3</sup> After the enforcement of the Edict of Restitution, the growing power of the emperor, and the tyrannies of Wallenstein, frightened even the Catholics; and, therefore, they joined the Protestants in demanding the dismissal of the noble *condottiere*. Ferdinand relied on the Catholics for the election of his son as "king of the Romans" (and, therefore, future emperor); and he unwillingly ordered his arrogant commander to retire to his estates. Many writers attribute the fall of Wallenstein, and also the refusal of the electors to accommodate Ferdinand in the promotion of his son, to the influence of the agent of Richelieu, the celebrated "grey cardinal," the Capuchin, Joseph (François LeClerc de Tremblay). But it is certain that the electors had decided on asking for the dismissal of Wallenstein, and on refusing the election of the "king of the Romans," before Father Joseph arrived at Ratisbon, where the

<sup>1</sup> Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II.*, vol. iii., p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Hurter, *Ibi.*, pp. 28, 41. Heyne, *Der Kurfürstentag zu Regensburg von 1630*, p. 18. Ranke, *Geschichte Wallensteins*, p. 167.

<sup>3</sup> Hurter, *Ibi.*, pp. 71, 74.

discussions were held. The rôle of the Capuchin at the Diet of Ratisbon was simply that of a peacemaker.<sup>1</sup>

The House of Austria was now called to confront a new adversary, the king of Sweden; and France was to support him more actively than she had the Danish monarch.

This period of the Thirty Years' War claims more attention than we have considered necessary to devote to the Palatine and Danish periods; for the Lion of the North, the "king of the snows," is almost venerated by the average Protestant. While Protestantism capable of making saints, and having made them, conscientiously praying to them, Gustavus Adolphus would have been canonized. On December 9, 1594, in the castle of Stockholm a son was born to Charles, duke of Sudermania, the third son of that king, Gustavus Wasa, who had introduced Protestantism into Sweden.<sup>2</sup> In remembrance of this monarch, and of his maternal grandfather, Adolphus of Holstein, the babe was christened Gustavus Adolphus. Ten years before this event, the famous Danish astronomer (and astrologist), Tycho-Brahe, had discovered a new star in the constellation of Cassiopea; and it was said, when Gustavus Adolphus appeared, that the scientist had declared that his heavenly birth prognosticated the coming of a northern prince who was to be the saviour of the then nascent and persecuted "Protestant Church." Charles of Sudermania mounted the Swedish throne in 1604; and one of his chief cares was the careful education of his heir. Besides his paternal language, the young prince learned to use fluently the Latin, Italian, French, German, and Dutch tongues; and when he had attained to the age of eleven his father made him assist at the sessions of the council of State and at the reception of ambassadors. In 1611 the death of Charles IX. made Gustavus Adolphus king of Sweden; and one of his first acts was the appointment of his former tutor, Axel Oxenstierna,

<sup>1</sup> Heyne, *loc. cit.*, pp. 134-137. Charverlat, *Histoire de la Guerre de Trente Ans*, vol. i., pp. 538-544.

<sup>2</sup> The Treaty of Calmar, 1397, had united Sweden, Norway, and Denmark under one crown, although each of these Scandinavian kingdoms retained its own laws and privileges. But the Swedes refused to be bound by the agreement, and during the fifteenth century they were governed by administrators chosen from the family of the Sture. Christian II. of Denmark endeavored to restore the union of the two kingdoms; and as Pope Leo X. supported his claims, the Swedes became hostile to the Holy See. When Christian returned to Denmark, after his conquest of Sweden, Gustavus Ericson, one of the noble family of the Wasa, headed a revolt, was proclaimed administrator, and finally became king of Sweden, in 1523, under the name Gustavus Wasa. The discontent of the Swedes with Pope Leo X. encouraged him to seize the property of the Church in order to replenish his exhausted treasury; and as an excuse, he found that the true gospel had just been announced at Wittenberg. Gförrer, *Gustav-Adolph, König von Schweden, und Seine Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1863. L. von Sen, *Gustaf Adolf*, Leipsig, 1869.

to the royal chancellorship. To the day of his death he showed the utmost confidence in this faithful servant. Gustavus Adolphus was an intense absolutist. Until he ascended the throne, the Swedish Diets had assembled regularly, and had shared the initiative with the monarch. But the young king ordained that thereafter he alone should enjoy this prerogative; the Diet having merely the privilege of respectfully presenting a remonstrance at the close of the session. Again, hitherto the royal power had been limited not only by the Diet, but by the Reichsrath or council of the kingdom, which was composed of the leading nobles, and had always been accustomed to deliberate with the sovereign on all important matters. Gustavus allowed this body to subsist in name; but he consulted, when he cared to do so, and only then, five special councils—those of justice, war, marine, foreign affairs, and finance—every member of which was designated by himself. Gustavus Wasa had already deprived the clergy of much of their authority and influence; but Gustavus Adolphus resolved to render his ministers docile creatures of his royal will. He instituted a consistory, so composed that he might always rely upon the subservience of the majority to any desire or whim of his Majesty. This sycophantic body appointed all the pastors, exercised over printed matter a rigid censorship which the Roman Index would have admired rather than imitated, and presided over all literary and eleemosynary institutions. As to religious liberty, the mind of Gustavus Adolphus, like that of every Protestant prince of his day, harbored but one idea on the subject; it was the duty and the privilege of his subjects to profess the creed which their royal master might chance to adopt as his own. Immediately on his accession, the Diet of Nyköping agreed with its lord that Lutheranism was to be maintained in Sweden, even though extreme measures were necessary for that end; and in 1617 the Diet of Oebro obeyed the royal will by decreeing that the penalty for high treason should be visited upon every Swede who, even in the privacy of his own house, and only in the bosom of his family, would be guilty of any Catholic practices. In fact, many persons, and in 1623 three public functionaries, mounted the scaffold in accordance with this law.<sup>1</sup> In fine, with the advent of Gustavus Adolphus, all the institutions of the Middle Ages vanished from Sweden, and the government became an absolute monarchy, without a vestige of either civil or religious liberty.

The sole object of Gustavus Adolphus was to augment his kingdom, and to dominate. The Swedes were for him merely so many instruments for the advancement of his glory. He continued the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gfroerer, *loc cit.*, pp. 70, 109, 125.

policy of his family, the acquisition of the Baltic regions, and consequent conversion of that sea into a Swedish lake. In 1628, after long and cruel wars, he possessed all the Baltic shores, excepting those of Denmark, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania. The greater part of the still coveted territory was a dependency of the Holy Roman Empire, at the head of which was the House of Austria, then the most powerful in Christendom. But Germany was divided by the greed for ecclesiastical property and domain, and the emperor had alienated the Protestants by his Edict of Restitution—a measure which was perfectly legal and otherwise legitimate, since it simply ordered the observance of the Peace of Augsburg, when it enjoined upon the Protestants a surrender of goods which they had seized in violation of that treaty. However, this edict was an act of bad policy on the part of Ferdinand; for he lost for him the support of many of the German princes, especially that of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, the former of whom had ever been warmly attached to the House of Hapsburg. While this fever agitated Germany, Gustavus Adolphus determined to actuate his dream of Baltic conquest.

At this period, France had resolved to perfect, to "round out" her frontiers by the annexation of Alsace, and to diminish the power of Austria by procuring the transfer of the imperial crown to the House of Bavaria. Therefore, since France and Sweden had a common adversary, it was natural for them to unite; and Richelieu thought that when Gustavus had served his purpose, he could easily withdraw from the alliance. By the influence of the cardinal, the war between Sweden and Poland was terminated by the armistice of Altmark; and Gustavus was then free to attack Germany. The ambitious monarch had no justification for interfering in German affairs; and he was so well convinced of the fact, that he did not dare to assemble the Swedish Diet in order to go through the farce of asking its opinion as to the advisability of declaring war. He simply informed some of the most docile members of his sufficiently docile council that a state of war "already subsisted" between the Empire and Sweden, and that the sole question for consideration was, as to which of the parties should make the attack.<sup>1</sup> Nothing was more certain than that the emperor Ferdinand had in no way menaced Sweden; if he had thought of creating an imperial fleet in the Baltic, it was merely for the defeat of Denmark. Gustavus vaunted himself the defender of the German princes, but none of these had asked his aid; the duke of Pomerania had even begged him to stay away from Germany. It is interesting to note that Frederick I

<sup>1</sup> Richelieu, *Memoires*, vol. v., p. 147. Gförrer, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 134.

of Prussia, who was not at all scrupulous about the ethics of conquest, after detailing the complaints of Gustavus against the emperor, declared that "none of these reasons could justify the arming of nations against each other, the ruination of the most flourishing provinces, and a prodigal effusion of human blood, in order to satisfy the ambition and caprice of one man."<sup>1</sup> That he might the more successfully pose as the offended and innocent party, Gustavus affected to consider Germany and Sweden as having been placed already in a state of hostility by the emperor's interference in Poland; and therefore, he did not deign to declare war—a course which was unprecedented in those days. At that time, statesmen were more punctilious, to say the least, than they are in our day; then, the world would have been astounded had a king of Sardinia invaded the territories of the Pope and of the king of the Two Sicilies, without the formality of a declaration of war. Whether or not Gustavus Adolphus, like many of the *condottieri* of his time, preserved something of the gentleman even amid the ruffianliness of the brigand, he seems to have felt the necessity of excusing his filibustering conduct; for he caused trusty agents to scatter throughout Europe copies of a manifesto written in Latin, entitled, "Reasons why the king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, has been forced to disembark on German soil with an army." They who would fain regard the royal adventurer as an angel of the Most High, bearing the flaming sword of a Macchabee in defence of the persecuted children of God, will perforce observe that the sentiments of this justificatory document are of the earth, earthy. "The king of Sweden has done all that he could to prevent this war (an absolute falsehood). He has long closed his ears to the urgent appeals (which did not exist) of his relatives and his co-religionists in Germany, because he still hoped that the emperor would cease to persecute these innocents (Ferdinand had persecuted no one). But he finds himself obliged by the strongest of reasons (greed of territory), to obtain by the sword that satisfaction which has been refused to his prayers. The imperialists have intercepted his letters (which was their right) to the prince of Transylvania, Bethlen Gabor, (a sworn vassal of the Turk, and usurper of the crown of Hungary), and maltreated the messenger. The emperor has fomented discord between Sweden and Poland, and has furnished two armies to king Sigismund (to aid this prince against an iniquitous invasion). . . . He has tried to dominate the Baltic, which is a violation of the rights of Sweden, to which country, in common with Denmark, that sea

---

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de Frederic II.*, edition 1789, vol. i, p. 55. Koch, *loc. cit.*, in Introduction, p. 7.

has always belonged (a new clause in the law of nations). . . . under the pretence of punishing rebels, and of causing a restitution of ecclesiastical property, the emperor has oppressed all the princes of Germany, and has tried to force them under his yoke (Ferdinand merely upheld the German constitution). The emperor has rejected all my propositions of peace (which were purposely so couched that no German patriot could accept them); and nothing remains for the king of Sweden but war in order to obtain justice (a Scandinaldo-German empire)." In this manifesto, the alleged Macchabee scarcely alludes to religious questions. Indeed he caused the Genevan professor, Spanheim, to compose a work in proof of the fact that his Swedish majesty was not undertaking a religious war.<sup>1</sup>

Gustavus Adolphus owed his first successes in Germany to the excellence of his troops, inured to hardship and thoroughly drilled in his Polish campaigns. Nor should it be forgotten that the Swede alone directed his army, as he did his policy; whereas Ferdinand could effect nothing without the concurrence of the electors. Complete unity fought for the former; perpetual discord harassed the latter. But in spite of these advantages, Gustavus remained for six months without doing anything but occupying the mouths of the Oder; then the treaty of Berwald, concluded with France, enabled him to capture Frankfort, and thus to master the entire river. Compelling his brother-in-law, the elector of Brandenburg, to a less than half-hearted alliance, he obtained control of the basin of the Elbe. The elector of Saxony, frightened by the Edict of Restitution, was as yet neutral; but when Tilly summoned him, in the name of the emperor, to lay down his arms, he perforce joined the Swede. This alliance was decisive for Gustavus. Having no longer any fear for his rear, he pushed forward and vanquished Tilly at Leipsic, thanks to the disobedience of Pappenheim more than to the unwieldiness of the imperial army, still hampered by the now antiquated Spanish tactics. Gustavus could now have advanced to Vienna, but he preferred to wait for reinforcements; meanwhile invading Franconia and the ecclesiastical electorates of the Rhine. Had he been animated, as is asserted *usque ad nauseam*, by the sole desire of saving German Protestantism, he would have marched on the Austrian capital immediately after his victory at Leipsic; for, in order to checkmate him, the emperor would have abrogated the Edict of Restitution, which, indeed, had been renounced so far as Saxony was concerned. But then Gustavus would have returned to his kingdom of snow with naught but glory for his profit. There would

<sup>1</sup> *Mercure Francais*, vol. xvi., pt. 2, p. 297.



have remained no further need for his presence in Germany; and if he attempted to annex any German soil, the now contented Protestants would have joined the Catholics in driving him beyond the Baltic. Gustavus entertained no idea of being content with the reputation of a Protestant Macchabee; and since he was not yet sufficiently powerful to wrest any concession of territory from the emperor, he seized upon what was at his mercy, the ecclesiastical states on the Main and the Rhine. At this juncture he illustrated his views on the matter of religious toleration. Erfurt, then a populous city, was a dependency of the archbishop-elect of Mayence; but this prelate had always allowed it to govern itself in an independence similar to that of the imperial free cities. Under the protection of the archbishop-elect, the Protestant maxim of *Cujus regio, etc.*, had never been actuated. The Lutherans had been allowed to live in peace with their fellow-citizens. But when this alleged champion of religious liberty entered Erfurt he issued a pronunciamiento declaring that all Catholics were excluded from his favor, and he heeded the prayers of the municipal council not to expel all the priests, only on condition that these should swear lasting fidelity to the king of Sweden. Then he decreed that all the Protestant ministers and university professors should be exempted from war taxes; but he levied a double quota on the Catholic clergy.<sup>1</sup>

The successes of Gustavus Adolphus alarmed Richelieu, who had wished to lessen the power of Austria, but in favor of France and Bavaria, Catholic powers, rather than the aggrandizement of Protestant Sweden. Therefore, the sagacious cardinal-minister insisted that Gustavus should spare the Catholic League—that is, the Catholic princes of Germany. But the Swedish monarch would make no distinction between the emperor and the Catholic princes, and his good fortune rendered him impatient of Richelieu's dictation. He even threatened to attack France. Then Richelieu withdrew his subsidies; but Gustavus felt the loss scarcely at all, having then at his command the resources of the richest parts of Germany. Meanwhile the command of the imperial army had been restored to Wallenstein. Perceiving that his enemy was menacing his communications with the north, Gustavus concentrated his forces near Nuremberg, and finally, on November 16, 1632, he defeated Wallenstein at Lutzen, but perished on the field.<sup>2</sup> Had the Lion of the North survived the battle

<sup>1</sup> Klopp, *Tilly*, vol. ii., p. 343; Gfrörer, *loc. cit.*, p. 671.

<sup>2</sup> Duke Francis Albert of Saxe-Lauenburg, who was with Gustavus during nearly the whole of the battle, has been accused of assassinating him. But the testimony of the royal page, August Leubeling, and of the royal chamberlain, Truchsess, both of whom were in immediate attendance on Gustavus at the fatal moment, shows that the



of Lutzen, would he have remained contented with the foundation of a Scandinavian empire entirely enclosing the Baltic? Or would he have mounted the throne of Germany? Certainly there were many in Germany who talked at that time of placing on his brow the imperial crown. But had he attempted the latter project he would have failed; for not only would he have encountered a Franco-Hispano-Austrian opposition, but he would have had to withstand the enmity of even the Protestants of Germany, whom Ferdinand would assuredly have conciliated by a revocation of the Edict of Restitution. Already the elector of Saxony had refused to aid him at Lutzen, and had formed the design of heading a third party for the purpose of forcing a peace between Sweden and the empire.

Not for a moment had Gustavus Adolphus any intention to establish in Germany either civil or religious liberty. If he delivered the German princes from the suzerainty of their emperor, it was to impose upon them one which was still more severe, since it had no limit or criterion but his own will. As to religious liberty, no prince of the day clung with such tenacity to the soul-enthralling maxim of *Cujus regio*; and if he did not apply the principle to Germany with as much zeal as he had exhibited in Sweden, it was because of his need of the friendship of Richelieu. His admirers are probably correct in their estimate of the sincerity of their hero as a Lutheran; but precisely because of that sincerity, he could have favored no system of religious equality. Whenever he displayed some show of justice to German Catholics, it was because the politician momentarily dominated the fanatic. Gustavus Adolphus used religion as a means for the increase of his earthly power—for the foundation of a Scandinavian empire; and in executing his design, he certainly displayed great craft as a statesman and consummate ability as a general. As a general, he introduced a revolution in military tactics; he rendered his army more manageable than any other; his artillery was lighter in the handling and more numerous; his genius on the field was great. Probably he was really pious; but his fondness for preaching and psalm-singing savored of cant. It was a good stroke of policy for Gustavus, when about to leave his icy regions in order to seek his fortune with the aid of the millions of Richelieu, to vaunt himself the envoy of the Most High. Alaric, Attila, Mohammed, Cromwell, and other formidable mystics, have always insisted upon

---

ball which he received in the back came from the imperial cuirassiers, who had surrounded him and his staff, and out of whose ranks he was trying to cut his way. Unhorsed, he extended his hands for relief to Leubelfing, and as the page was trying to raise him from the ground, a cuirassier shot him through the head.—Gfrörer, *loc. cit.* p. 786; Mauvillon, *Histoire de Gustave-Adolphe*, p. 572.

divine vocation when about to appropriate the things of earth; and as Gustavus was of the same mould, he did well in posing as a Judas Macchabeus. But we can scarcely suppose a Macchabeus guilty of such mendacious hypocrisy as that manifested by Gustavus Adolphus when he bade farewell to the Estates of Sweden: "Let no one believe that I precipitate myself into this war without good reason. I call the Omnipotent God, in whose presence I speak, to witness that I do not fight for my own pleasure. I am forced to the combat. The emperor has offended me in the gravest manner. He aids my enemies; he persecutes my co-religionists, the Protestants of Germany, who are groaning under the yoke of the Pope, and who extend toward me their suppliant hands. . . . Before separating from you, I invoke upon you the protection of the Almighty; and you especially, valiant nobles, I recommend to the divine protection. *Be worthy descendants of the ancient Goths!*" But whether the piety of Gustavus Adolphus was sincere or feigned, it is certain that his impartial contemporaries regarded him as a politician rather than as a devotee. Pope Urban VIII. would never discern in him the declared adversary of the Catholic Church; he persisted in regarding the Swedish monarch as merely the foe of the House of Austria; and it was said that when the news of the king's death reached the Vatican, the Pontiff offered Mass for the departed soul.<sup>1</sup> The private life of Gustavus Adolphus, if compared with that of most Protestant princes of his day, was exemplary; he seems to have cherished but one immoral intimacy, and that one did not last for a long time. Glory was the chief love of his inmost heart; but it is certain that in order to satisfy his passion, he could forget his solemn promises, and that his interests were often considered before the dictates of justice.<sup>2</sup>

After the death of Gustavus Adolphus, the Swedes and German Protestants lost ground; they were beaten at Nordlingen, and the House of Austria recovered its power. By the Treaty of Prague, May 30, 1635, the emperor drew to his side many of the Protestants; and his authority became as great as it had been after the defeats of the palatine and of the Danish king. But at the moment when nothing seemed to thwart his triumph, France called upon him to halt. Hitherto, Richelieu had combated Austria in merely an indirect manner; now he declared open war. Then ensued the most brilliant period of the Thirty Years' War, illustra-

<sup>1</sup> Droysen, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 665. Richelieu, in his *Memoirs*, merely says: "When the Pope heard this news, he went to the national church of the Germans, and celebrated a low mass."

<sup>2</sup> For instance, his treatment of the palatine, his invasion of Pomerania, and his compulsion of the elector of Brandenburg to the alliance.

ted on the part of France, by *le grand Condé* and Turenne, and on the part of Austria and Spain, by the Italians, Montecuculli and Piccolomini. The struggle was an alternation of successes and reverses on both sides. For an instant the Austrians and Spaniards invaded France; but were repelled before they could reach Paris. Then the French and Swedes transferred the war to Germany, but they could not penetrate to Vienna. Little by little exhaustion was entailed by the gigantic efforts put forth by both parties, and despite the stubborn opposition of Spain, Austria resolved to make peace. Like nearly all the treaties of modern times, the Peace of Westphalia was not inspired by principle. Convenience, not justice, was the thing sought. "Accomplished facts," which some innocents deem the discovery of Napoleon II and Lord Palmerston, had been already consecrated by the Peace of Augsburg, in the permission accorded to the Protestants to retain the goods of the Church which they had stolen before the year 1552; and the Peace of Westphalia repeated the consecration by allowing the thieves to retain what they had annexed before 1624. Whatever could be obtained was demanded; nothing was conceded that could be withheld or recovered. The unity of the Holy Roman Empire in Germany was weakened, inasmuch as the emperor lost much of his power, to the profit of the German sovereigns. The treaty pleased no one. The Catholics lamented the loss of much ecclesiastical dominion and property; and the Protestants were irritated by the prohibition to purloin any more. The ratifications of the treaty were exchanged in 1649, in spite of the efforts of Chigi, the papal nuncio at Vienna. In January, 1653, Pope Innocent X., in his Bull *Zelus Domus Dei*, protested against the usurpation of ecclesiastical goods, and declared the treaty null. In fact, the signatories had exceeded their powers in suppressing bishoprics without the consent of the Holy See, and in disposing of goods which did not belong to them. The Pope alone regarded the rights of things; the signers looked upon everything from a point of view, the basis of which was brute force.<sup>1</sup> One of the chief results of the Peace of Westphalia was the loss by Germany of that primacy which she had enjoyed in the Middle Ages. The Germans had feared the supremacy of the Latin race, and hence, if for no other reason, many of them had espoused the cause of the Reformation: and hence, also, they combated Spain, and Spain being Catholic, they warred also against Catholicism. But they succeeded only in consolidating the House of Austria, which thenceforward until our days retained a super-

<sup>1</sup> Bougeant, *Histoire du Traité de Westphalie*, vol. iii., p. 631. Ranke, *Die Römischen Papste*, vol. ii., p. 566.

macy in Germany, and an overwhelming share in the dominion of Italy. As Cantù observes: "Instead of abolishing the empire, the Germans abolished the Pope; instead of acquiring civil and municipal liberty, they obtained the privilege of not going to Mass or to confession, and of singing the Psalms in German. Italy suffered still more; her fruitful division into little states disappearing before the Austro-Spanish domination which was no longer counterbalanced by France, although this domination was compelled to some degree of restraint by the republics of Venice and Genoa."<sup>1</sup>

The Peace of Westphalia was the first compact entered into by the European powers in accordance with the new *jus publicum*, based upon the idea of a material balance of power. Thirty years of unprofitable slaughter, and of indiscriminate destruction of nearly all civilizing agencies,<sup>2</sup> had convinced sovereigns that for some time, neither Catholicism nor heresy would attain a securely dominant position, and by the famous treaty they agreed on mutual toleration. Then Protestantism acquired a legal existence in a large part of Europe, and Rome began to fear that the days of heresy were to be long in those regions. But the chief reason for which Pope Innocent X. reprobated the Peace of Westphalia was found in its sanction of that absolutely pagan canon that the sovereign of a country is, of right, the master and sole *ratio essendi* of that country's religion. With this principle legally sanctioned and enforced, it is no wonder that an end was put for a time to the Catholic renaissance which had followed the celebration of the Council of Trent. But the temporal dominion of the Roman Pontiff in the States of the Church obtained some advantages at this time. Urban VIII. recovered Montefeltro, Urbino, Pesaro and Sinigaglia, and he firmly resisted the efforts of his nephews to obtain these territories in fief.

And now a word about the position occupied during the Thirty Years' War by two prominent churchmen, Pope Urban VIII. and Cardinal Richelieu; for any commentary upon the career of Gustavus Adolphus would be incomplete without such notice. Urban VIII. deemed it his duty, both as pontiff and as temporal sovereign, to take an active part in the politics of his time. In considering the questions which then divided Germany into two hostile

<sup>1</sup> *Eretici d'Italia*. Discourse 47.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy See succeeded in saving from amid the devastations of the Thirty Years' War the great Palatine Library of Heidelberg, which was transported to Rome, and afterward, in 1815, restored. We may here note that although Rome fulfilled her part of the agreement of the Congress of Vienna concerning the restoration of objects of art, etc., to their rightful owners, many of her own artistic and literary properties were retained in various capitals.

parties, and which entailed a bloody rivalry between France and the House of Hapsburg, the Pope thought it proper to pronounce against Austria and Spain. Like nearly all of his predecessors in the papal chair, Urban VIII. dreaded any increase of the imperial power in Italy. In pursuance of a policy which was both natural and proper in a Pope, he allied himself with France in the question of the Valtelline, an Italian valley parallel with the Engadine, through which flows the Adda as far as the Lake of Como, between two mountain ranges, which separate it from Venice on the south and from the Grisons on the north. All Europe was at that time convulsed because of this little valley, for its position gave to its occupier immense strategic advantages. The Hapsburgs were dominant in Germany; a branch of the family reigned in Spain, in the Milanese and in Naples, and in most of the New World. Was the Valtelline to become a Spanish possession? Then it would be a road for an army from Germany into Italy, and let the Swiss and the Grisons espouse which side they would, France, quite naturally, coveted the Valtelline, if for no other reason than to check the power of Austria. Then there were the Grisons, sustained by Switzerland, Holland, and more or less openly by England. No wonder, therefore, that Urban VIII. sided with France. The great Richelieu was then at the head of affairs in the land of the Lilies, and he so shaped his anti-Austrian policy that many of his best friends reproved him for acting contrary to the interests of the Church. It is not for us to apologize for his action in allying the Eldest Daughter of the Church with a monarch whose triumph could not but be detrimental to Catholicism. He certainly felt ashamed of his policy, and shed tears of compunction when deciding upon it in full council. He thought to cover his shame under the papal mantle, by trying to obtain at least an indirect sanction for his diplomacy from the Pontiff. When imperial arms had triumphed in Germany, an army was about to act in Poland against the Swedes, and the Spaniards had furnished another for service against the Netherlanders; another force was to attack the Duke of Mantua, then under the protection of France. Wallenstein, the man who gives history so many surprises, was so enraged at Pope Urban for his non-approval of the Edict of Restitution, that he urged the emperor to send an expedition against Rome—another one of the many undertaken by a German imperial army—saying that as a century had passed since the emperor Charles V. had sacked the papal capital, the booty would now be of immense value. At this juncture Richelieu concluded his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, providing, however, that the Swede should promise to tolerate the Catholic religion wherever he found it. The emperor loudly complained of the pontific

refusal to condemn directly the contract between the cardinal and the Swedish king, and of the hesitancy of the Holy See in pronouncing the war a religious war. The reclamations of Ferdinand II. were presented to the Pontiff by Pazmany, archbishop of Gran, and were supported in full consistory by the Spanish envoy, Cardinal Borgia, who went so far as to reproach the Pope with a culpable indifference toward the true interests of the Catholic Church.<sup>1</sup> The Sacred College was divided as to the course to be pursued, and prompted by Cardinal Ludovisi, some of their Eminences even advised the convocation of a General Council to consider the matter. It is evident that, unlike all Protestant historians, Urban VIII. did not regard the Thirty Years' War as one of religion, but rather as one of worldly interests. The same may be said of Richelieu, who intended to cast Gustavus Adolphus aside, so soon as he had served the purposes of France.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

---

<sup>1</sup> A few years after this reproof of Urban VIII. by the imperialists, the Gallicans, more loyal to their king than to the Holy See, upbraided Innocent XI. because of his resistance to the pretensions of Louis XIV., with being not only a protector of Protestants, but a Protestant himself. It was then that Lafontaine wrote :

“ Et tout le parti Protestant  
Du Saint-Pere en vain très-content,  
Le chevalier de Sillery  
En parlant de ce Pape-cy,  
Souhaitait pour la paix publique,  
Qu'il se fust rendu Catholique.”

---



## THE OPENING OF A JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATE DOCUMENT "CUM MAGNOPERE."

THE instruction of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, in 1880, more familiar to us here in the somewhat modified form given it by the Congregation of the Propaganda when introducing it four years later to the bishops of the United States, has given official sanction to an important modification in judicial procedure.

We do not propose to study in this article the document in its parts, our object being merely to examine it as bearing on the introduction of a case, and to see whether the famous principle of *prævia infamatio* formerly so necessary for the opening of criminal cases, still retains its full force and judicial consequences.

Before entering more fully into the subject-matter of our paper, it will be well to sketch the origin of this new discipline and to recall to mind the state of things which it comes to replace.

\* \* \* \* \*

In the troubled times in which we live, consequent on the widening divergence which shows itself in old Catholic countries between the spirit of Christianity and the principles of indifference or hostile legislations, the attention of the Church is drawn to the constantly increasing difficulty of maintaining a judicial procedure framed for wholly different surroundings. It is hardly necessary to add that these difficulties are found still greater when the Church is brought in contact with nations under heretical governments, in countries like our own, whose very constitution proclaims the absolute separation of church and state.

The Catholic hierarchy is, indeed, often deprived of the means of exercising its authority over the persons, objects, or cases within its jurisdiction, or at least its action is too often hampered by civil laws. It is thus that certain criminal cases of laymen, which according to canon law should belong to the ecclesiastical courts, are never tried there. There is no use in indulging in any useless recrimination over this—we must keep up with the times. There are other and still greater inconveniences. Thus, the episcopal courts find themselves in a position in which they are unable to observe the judicial forms prescribed by law, either because they cannot summon or compel the attendance of witnesses as required, or because all enforcements by the usual sanctions

constraint and punishment are now-a-days denied them. It is easy to imagine, how, prior to the remodelling of the judicial code of procedure such a state of things was subversive of discipline. In almost every case might be found substantial defects arising from a non-compliance with canonical requirements, and the parties interested in the case took advantage of this to dispute the judicial sentence as grounded on an irregular process; therefore, appeals to Rome, based on defects of form, were multiplied beyond all measure to the great detriment of order and peace. This deplorable state of things called for the remonstrance of the bishops who were incapable both of maintaining order in their dioceses and of enforcing the canonical remedies prescribed in the second book of the Decretals. From all sides rose a demand for a more simple judicial form; for one, which, while retaining all the salient and essential features of the old, would be free from the complicated formalities which interfered with its daily usefulness.

This appeal was not in vain. The bishops of France and Italy were the first to get authority to employ henceforth a more summary form; a few years later on this rule became the succinct code of criminal and disciplinary procedure in the United States. Never, indeed, in this Church which had grown so extensive and so important, had the effort to enforce the canonical law been entirely successful. Judgments were rendered "*ex æquo et bono*," which, according to many, meant neither in equity nor in justice, and the experimental rule of 1878 was productive of the most questionable results. But now we are in possession of a clearly defined code, to which (with the exception of a few exempted dioceses and vicariates still subject to the regulations of 1878), we must conform in treating all criminal and disciplinary cases of clerics "*summarie et sine strepitu*." A point, also to be remarked, is that the present instruction "*cum magnopere*" does not, like its prototype of 1880, give the bishops a merely facultative and commodious way of rendering justice, but it appears to constitute for the United States the ordinary method of procedure, to be followed "*sub pœna nullitatis actorum*," and also to replace for us in this country the more solemn procedure which the entire Church used heretofore. Such is the opinion of Mgr. Messmer our distinguished predecessor in the Chair of Canon Law in the Catholic University of America, as expressed in his able adaptation of Dr. Droste's work on canonical procedure. Such also is our opinion.

Again, if we examine the matter closely, we shall see this is a natural deduction from Article 311 of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. "*Processum judiciale Episcopus instruere debet vel ob . . . vel . . . eumque summarie et sine strepitu conficiat.*"



The expressions "forma œconomica, summaria," should not deceive any one; they are used merely to bring out in greater relief the difference established between the present procedure and the various usages of other times; moreover it is perfectly correct to present to designate the rules of the Constitution *Cum Magnopere* in the canonical terminology of "forma canonica—forma ordinaria," etc.

We can hardly appreciate the prudence which guided the framing of this important document. Following the wise principle that even a trifling negligence in the rules of procedure may hinder the demonstration of truth and so hamper and fetter the administration of justice, the legislator wished at one and the same time to protect the sacred rights of the accused, without curtailing in the least the rightful authority of the bishop. Hence the fatherly and patient measures enumerated in the first part of the instruction, those frequent warnings and monitions, slight punishments more medicinal than penal in their character, in a word the whole system which charitably lingers in repeated efforts to effect a cure before drawing up any formal indictment. Of course these premonitory measures cannot be employed in every case; there are some laws which of their very nature are so general and so essential that their very existence is a continual note of warning; there are some crimes so crying that justice can brook no delay, but is bound to act at once; still the same spirit of leniency and toleration is always manifest and even when prompt severity is an imperative obligation, and when to punish becomes a necessary duty; the charity, patience, and especially scrupulous justice which ever accompany the Church's action rob it of all semblance of harshness and win for it the respect of all.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is one point on which the document of 1884 insists with marked emphasis as meriting particular attention, and that is the mode of originating the process itself. The reasons for this are clear to every one. Under the old procedure the preliminary debates afforded numerous ways of reaching the truth, the frequent and reiterated examination of witnesses, an almost unrestricted liberty given to ecclesiastical judges as to the way of exercising their authority, the support in case of need of the civil power, and most of all throughout all classes of society a true sense of the Church's mission—all this singularly favored the administration of justice. We do not pretend that everything was perfect—far from it—it would be very easy to find subject for stinging criticism in the tiresome delays, the ridiculous quibbling and the barbarous methods of investigation which too often disgraced and dishonored certain tribunals of the past, but all the

does not concern us for the present. We merely wish to note that the preliminary investigation had not then the same importance which it has assumed in our day, because the trial afforded the fitting time and place for eliciting all the information required. However without serious and well-grounded reasons no criminal inquiry could be started, and outside the cases of formal complaint and official denunciation, the law never permitted a judge to institute criminal proceedings without having very reliable information inculcating the accused.

Here a question of no small importance arises. Common law and the majority of its best and most reliable interpreters look upon "*prævia infamatio*" or alleged culpability as so indispensably necessary that its sole absence makes a canonical inquiry instituted against an accused person, who is really but not ostensibly guilty, subject to rescission as irregular. Dr. Smith, so well known by his able adaptations of canon law to the wants of our clergy, and whose recent death leaves such a gap in the alas! too scattered ranks of American canonists, defends this view very energetically in many of his writings. Dr. Pierantonelli, whose competence in judicial matters is universally recognized, holds the contrary opinion. What are we to follow? The matter is of extreme importance, since nowadays, a great number of (not to say all) ecclesiastical cases are the outcome of a special inquiry undertaken at the instigation of the diocesan promotor. The bishop is bound by his pastoral office to employ every means in his power to root out abuses and to watch over the morals of his clergy, and he relies in a great measure on the promotor for a useful and intelligent discharge of this duty. Upon receiving trustworthy information of a crime, the promotor becomes in law the public prosecutor and is entrusted with the maintenance of justice and the law, and empowered to introduce a criminal or correctional charge which ought to originate *ex officio* "*nuncio quocumque modo ad curiam perlato*."

Supposing the promotor hears that one or two reliable and prudent persons are aware of the hitherto hidden excesses of an ecclesiastic of apparent good standing, or even of less odious faults, but constituting grave violations of the canons, *v.g.*, drunkenness, publishing newspaper attacks against diocesan authority, etc., what is to be done? . . .

The promotor's first duty is to inform the bishop of the abuse he has discovered. The "Instructio" of 1884 authorizes the immediate beginning of a trial on information received "*quocumque modo*." The canonical investigations then begin; but what about the *prævia diffamatio*?

Suppose the trial conducted in the usual way and the priest

convicted on the evidence brought forward and sentenced accordingly, is the sentence good and valid in law?

According to the majority of ancient authorities such a sentence is null and void, or at least subject to appeal and liable to be set aside. According to Dr. Pierantonelli and Mgr. Messmer (although the latter's opinion is not as clearly stated), the sentence holds good. We have no intention of taking upon ourselves the solution of the difficulty, although we admit a preference for the second opinion. Without then hazarding anything pretending to be a final settlement of a disputed and still open question of law we proceed to give the reasons which underlie our view of the matter.

\* \* \* \* \*

A criminal or disciplinary inquiry before the ecclesiastical courts has two very distinct phases—one private, the other public. The instruction, "*Cum Magnopere*," has exercised a marked influence over the latter; but it has given the former a very distinctive character, and upon this standpoint it has been carefully drawn up and minutely described.

To get a right understanding of the procedure in our modern judicial investigations it is necessary to recall to mind the three classical modes of originating a criminal process. This consideration is requisite when we remember that the promotor, whose presence is indispensable in our modern process, becomes the official public prosecutor, and that his information originally came from allegations lodged and inquiries instituted.

In the early stage of canon law, criminal proceedings usually originated from an *accusation* and complaint. In judicial language by accusation is meant an information preferred against a person charged with the commission of a criminal act, in view of a legal investigation and with the obligation of furnishing judicial proof of the charge advanced. This duty is often so disagreeable and the consequences so onerous in the ordinary course of human relations that, taken in connection with a less ardent faith, there are very few so devoted to the supreme good of religion as to expose themselves to so many inconveniences for its sake. Had other methods of obtaining the same results not been adopted, justice would have become powerless, to the great detriment of order and public discipline in the Church. Hence the law admitted and took cognizance of a complaint without exacting any demonstration of the charge. This way often proving inefficient, the example of the Roman civil law suggested to the Church the appointment of fiscal procurators with the double charge of looking after the interests of the diocese and of instituting legal proceedings against all violators of the ecclesiastical

laws. They take the place of the accuser of former times or lodge official information of any denunciation they receive. They belong, nevertheless, to the class of accusers. The *lex talionis*, or law of retaliation, has been abolished, and very wisely. The authority with which the promotor is invested, his exalted station, the moral dignity of his character, his legal knowledge attested by his selection, in addition to his various and weighty responsibilities, are so many reasons to free him from the disagreeable consequences of a duty which under other circumstances no devotedness would assume. With that one difference the promotor holds the place of the old accuser. His charges against the accused are in due time put in the form of an indictment and clothed in all the formalities established by legal custom. However, we must remark that the fact of the promotor getting an official position in the Curia did not abolish the old-time method of criminal procedure by accusation. It is true that this mode of originating a trial becomes less frequent every day; but still it retains its place on the statute books, and before disuse makes its practice illegal, all who wish to lodge complaints as accusers before the ecclesiastical courts are to be admitted. The fact is that no one may be lawfully excluded, and the XI. Art. of the Instruction, "*Cum Magnopere*," gives the reason when it mentions this method among the recognized forms of opening a trial: "Processus instruitur vel . . . vel accusatione, vel . . . etc." It is, however, to be remarked that even in case of an inquiry originating by accusation, the rules given in the Instruction must not be lost sight of. The duty of the examining judge, though lightened by the co-operation of the accuser, still retains its *raison d'être*, for the accused can only be summoned to answer the charges preferred against him when his guilt has been sufficiently established either by oral or by documentary evidence.

This procedure is, however, the exception rather than the rule; ordinarily, a crime is made known by *denunciation*. Denunciation is information conveyed to an ecclesiastical judge by a person who is trustworthy and reliable, but who is unwilling to assume the obligation of proving the charge. Here we have the point from which proceeds the special legislation governing the preliminary inquiry. The crime is known to the one who should suppress or punish it, but the proof is not given by the one who advances the complaint. Hence, a duty of extreme gravity falls on the judge, viz., the verification of the charge which alone entitles him to act. The importance of the judicial inquiry springs naturally from the very nature of the denunciation.

In spite of the prejudice which at first sight is aroused by the mere idea of informing on or denouncing another, the thoughtful

observer will not take long to discover the true nature, the necessity, even the exalted aim and noble object of this course. St. Thomas himself who says:<sup>1</sup> "Quædam peccata occulta quæ in nocumentum proximorum vel corporale vel spirituale . . . Et quia qui sic occulte peccat, non solum in se peccat, etiam in alios, oportet statim procedere ad denuntiationem uijusmodi nocumentum impediatur." Impossible to put the matter more clearly or more tersely. Authors draw a sharp distinction between evangelical and judicial denunciation. For us there is no necessity now to dwell on this distinction, but once more let us repeat how denunciation differs from accusation in not requiring judicial proof of what it advances. The effect of a serious denunciation answering all the required conditions is to originate a special inquiry. The judge, as Reiffenstuel remarks, not only *ought* to institute official proceedings, summon witnesses, collect evidence, etc.

This rapid sketch of the two primitive modes of beginning canonical inquiries formerly most in use, leads us to the consideration of the "inquisitio judicialis," which has grown very important owing to recent legislation, greatly changed in character.

Every bishop is under a strict obligation to enforce ecclesiastical discipline in his diocese, and there should be nothing to hinder him in the discharge of this important duty. "Habeant inquit episcopi," says Pope John,<sup>2</sup> "episcopi singularium urbium in suis diocesis liberam potestatem adulteria et scelera *inquirere*, ulcisci, et iudicare secundum quod Canones censeant, et absque impedimento alicuius." And the instruction "*Cum Magnopere*" inspired<sup>3</sup> with the same sentiments addresses the bishops in not less forcible terms in reference to the clergy in particular: "Ordinarius pro suo pastorem munere, tenetur disciplinam correptionemque clericorum ita diligenter curare, ut circa eorum mores assidue vigilet, ac remedia à Canonibus statuta, sive præcavendis, sive tollendis abusus clericum aliquando irrepentibus, providè adhibeat."

The bishop must however avoid being too severe a censor. He must know when it is better for him to close his eyes on a fault which he is powerless to correct. It is the prudent Gonzalez who says somewhere,<sup>4</sup> that in certain cases it is often better to leave some of the claims of justice unanswered than to give rise to

a whole series of abuses by an unwise severity which a little tolerance and indulgence would have prevented. St. Thomas also warns<sup>5</sup> against such judgments and punishments as are productive of no good

<sup>1</sup> 2. 2æ, Q., xxiii., a. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. I., Perniciosa, tit. xxxi. *De offic. judicis ordinarii*, lib. i. Decret.

<sup>3</sup> Art. I.

<sup>4</sup> *Comment.* Cap. 3, tit. ii, lib. ii. Decret.

<sup>5</sup> 2. 2æ, Q., xliii., a.

sult, "quando ex illis non medicina sed ruina potest evenire." It is needless to say how willingly we endorse such prudent counsels. Every one placed at the head of an important administration, especially entrusted with the government of men, should remember that moderation and charity are safer and better guides to follow than any exacting severity; nevertheless, a system of toleration bordering on weakness would be still more blamable in itself and more fatal in its consequences. An overstrained condescension, and forbearance, pushed beyond certain limits, are most lamentable shortcomings in a bishop and an unfailing source of ruin and disorder in a diocese. St. Gregory gives expression to this thought in his usual forceful and expressive language: "Compassionem<sup>1</sup> vero animi plerumque obsidet pietas falsa, ut hanc non nunquam usque ad condescendendum vitiis pertrahat, cum ad culpas quisque non debeat compassionem exercere sed zelum. Compassio quippe homini, et rectitudo vitiis debetur, ut in uno eodemque homine, et diligamus bonum quod factum est et persequamur mala quæ fecit, ne dum culpas incaute rimittimus, non jam per caritatem compati sed per negligentiam concidisse videamur." Such are the leading ideas which control the proceedings at the episcopal investigation. We have now to see these principles at work, for it is necessary to be fully acquainted with the details before entering upon a close study of our modern judicial inquiry.

Canonists carefully distinguish several forms of *Inquisitio*. First of all, there is the *inquisitio omnino generalis*, which the bishop makes in his ordinary pastoral visits, when he inquires into the observance of the laws and the various infractions committed against them. Again, there is an *inquisitio personalis*, or kind of investigation about persons, where there is no supposition of crime entertained. Such are the various investigations or inquiries instituted concerning persons about to be married, in order to discover any existing canonical impediments. Inquiries of a like nature are made in view of ecclesiastical preferments, the authorities having to see to "quis sit dignior." It need hardly be said that we have nothing to say here to these two kinds of inquiries. It may happen, however, that a bishop is aware of the existence of a crime without knowing the culprit; then he sets to work to make sure of the fact and all the circumstances connected with it. This is an *inquisitio*, or inquiry, which canonists call *general*. It becomes *special* when the inquiry extends to the person of the criminal as well as to the fact of the crime.

Before the recent instructions of the Roman Congregations, and in spite of all the practical difficulties which were in the way, the

<sup>1</sup> Homil., xxxii, in *Evang. Migne*. P. L., t. lxxvi., p. 1255.

judicial procedure was governed by the following rules: When a bishop became aware of a crime, or a grave violation of canonical discipline, either by formal complaint or even by public rumor, it was his duty to proceed to the *inquisitio generalis*. He was not bound to defer action until public opinion had incriminated a particular one; he could even give his investigation the recognized special character, provided inquiries were limited to the crime and not directed against any particular person. In other words, at the early stage of the proceedings the questions put to witnesses should be in the form of "Do you know the author of this crime?" rather than "Is Mr. A. or B. the culprit?" If, from the depositions of the witnesses or from the examination of the papers and documents in the case, the delinquent be not clearly designated, the inquiry should be brought to a close, lest the reputation of some one of good standing before the public become endangered from individual suspicions and misgivings. Perhaps the suspect was really the guilty party, but as long as his good name was recognized by the Canons gave him every advantage he was entitled to and forbade the judge to call it in question or to violate it.

Trifles, minutiae, we may hear some say. Far from it; for here is at stake the honor, the peace of mind, the very life of the accused, and no laws can be too particular in surrounding with every conceivable safeguard a good so far transcending all others. If it be a duty to repress wrong-doing, there is a still more sacred duty to protect private rights, and especially the noblest and best of all—an unspotted reputation. It is, then, with feelings akin to veneration that we read the long and sometimes complicated treatises of the old canonists who defended with such praiseworthy zeal every man's inalienable right to shield his name and character against the dangers of imprudently conducted investigations. No principle, however, must be considered merely in the cut-and-dried terms in which it is formulated. It must be a working principle, and so tested by the circumstances in which it will have to operate, and account taken of the many exceptions which will be found needed to modify its action. Here we have a striking example of this, which the reader will easily perceive if he follows us a little longer in an exposition somewhat arid and technical perhaps, but still of the utmost practical importance.

\* \* \* \* \*

The law which we gave above is clear. No judge is allowed to take proceedings *ex mero officio* against any alleged criminal unless the accused be already *diffamatus*. Innocent III. says positively: "*Respondemus nullum esse pro crimine super quo aliquâ non laborat infamiâ seu clamarosa insinuatio non praeceperit . . . puniendum. Quinimo super hac depositiones cont*

um recipi non debere, *quum inquisitio fieri debeat solummodo super illis de quibus clamores aliqui praecesserint.*" The glossa confirms the judicial bearing of this declaration, "Ex hoc habes quod de occultis non est inquirendum." The same doctrine and the same interpretations are met in many places in the "Corpus Juris." The Council of Lateran, in 1216, decrees,<sup>1</sup> "Sicut accusationem legitima debet praecedere inscriptio, sicut denuntiationem charitativa monitio, et inquisitionem clamorosa insinuatio praevenire." According to the glossa, a praevia infamatio is essential for the opening of a criminal case. Innocent III. is most positive in maintaining this principle. In the chapter "Cum oporteat"<sup>2</sup> we may read his very precise instructions given to the judges commissioned by him to investigate charges made against an unworthy bishop, where he dwelt with more than special emphasis on the reserve which should mark the opening of the trial. This idea had so entered into the spirit of the times that it was not uncommon to find criminals admitting their guilt and its malice, and still claiming the immunity accorded by Boniface VIII.,<sup>3</sup> without assigning any other reason than that proceedings were taken against them in the absence of any alleged culpability.<sup>4</sup> It is useless to multiply examples.

This infamatio, according to the commentators, should proceed from the reflections of upright and trustworthy persons, and not from the mere gossip of backbiters, which merits nothing but contempt, and several intimations of the same criminal fact should be made.<sup>5</sup> Schmalzgrubber, with that usual good sense which never fails him, gives us the reason of this regulation.<sup>6</sup> If, he tells us, every evil rumor afforded sufficient grounds for proceeding to an investigation, no one, even the very best, would be long safe, for evil tongues attack all, and everybody knows how rapidly and how widely evil reports circulate.

The wisdom of this course, even under its purely juridical features, commends itself to every thoughtful mind. Hear the proof Lessius advances: "Judex," he says, "quando ad punitio-nem criminum procedit debet ex scientiâ publicâ procedere: scientia autem publica est quæ habetur per accusationem vel con-

<sup>1</sup> Cap. 24, "Qualiter," tit. i., *De Accusationibus*, lib. v., Decret.

<sup>2</sup> 19, tit. i., lib. Decret.

<sup>3</sup> Cap. "Postquam," 1 tit. i., lib. v. in 6°.

<sup>4</sup> Cap. "Si is," 2, tit. i., lib. v. in 6°.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. cap. "Qualiter," 24 tit., lib. v., *Decretalium*: "si per clamorem et famam ad aures superioris pervenerit non quidem a malevolis et maledicis, sed a providis et honestis, non semel tantum, sed sæpe quod clamor innuit et diffamatio manifestat."

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, t. x., v. 19).



sessionem rei in iudicio, vel per infamiam aut per facti evidentiam in conspectu iudicis vel aliorum."<sup>1</sup>

Ecclesiastical authorities have, we must say, no reason for neglecting this rule. Their own peace of mind, the natural desire of keeping clear of all untimely complications, the dread of drawing upon themselves well-deserved opprobrium, are motives usually sufficient to enforce the observance of the law and to prevent undue hurry. However, we must take into consideration the weakness of our human nature and admit that circumstances might easily arise in which a superior would be impelled by feelings of personal animosity to inquire into the hidden transgressions of an inferior. These precautions, officially adopted by the Church, are far from being uncalled for; they are often most needed checks on misplaced zeal. Another danger to be equally avoided is in being too great a stickler for the mere letter of the law, and in retrenching oneself behind too absolute a formalism. Good common sense in default of law texts, the well-founded experience of practitioners, the precedents and rulings of the tribunals, all conspire in forming a kind of unwritten code of exceptions, the justice of which no one ever dreams of disputing or questioning. Thus, it is certain that there is no need of *prævia diffamatio* to sanction the opening of a trial against a public delinquent. Publicity may be had in more ways than one. To say nothing of the crimes occurring during the very hearing of a case, such as the open perjury of a witness, etc., self-incrimination, even indirectly intimated, answers the purpose of publicity. Again, the accused may waive his right to profit by *prævia infamatio*, and allow the process to be started. And we may go even still further, and admit that any incriminatory information, even made with wicked purpose, received by the bishop in the course of a general inquiry, suffices to warrant the introduction of a suit before the episcopal court.

Another class of exceptions is often called into being by the very nature of things; thus indications, unmistakably clear, produce such a semblance of guilt as to forbid any delay in proceeding for a trial. Again, crimes are so often correlated or linked and chained together that the presence of one creates almost a moral certainty of the reality of another. Thus, for example, we would lose our time in trying to convince any one that a *prævia diffamatio* of murder was necessary against one juridically convicted of criminal intercourse with the murdered man's faithful wife. The finger of suspicion points unmistakably to the guilty party.

<sup>1</sup> *De jure et justitia*, lib. ii., cap. xxix., No. 122.

Lastly, there is another category of wrongs which is excepted from the rule given above. Some crimes are most pregnant of evil and very disastrous in their consequences. Some, such as heresy and apostacy, may rob the soul of faith; others may work irreparable harm to a third party or endanger the whole community; some such as give rise to diriment impediments may render a sacrament null and void; others may procure the ecclesiastical preferment of some unworthy subject, etc. It would be puerile, in offences such as these, to dally over formalities, however estimable in themselves, when every haste and effort should be made to secure the general good. Here, again, action may precede any *prævia infamatio*. These exceptions evidently limit the extension and application of the principle.

\* \* \* \* \*

But the matter before us is of quite a different nature. At present there can be no longer question of those investigations made by the bishops in their rare and stately pastoral visits of long ago, when communications were slow and difficult, and seldom undertaken, and when the want of publicity made the knowledge of crime a matter of no easy attainment. To-day distances are, as it were, abolished; the daily press, the telegraph, the continual ebb and flow of travel, a detective and police service thoroughly equipped and perfectly organized, render the concealment of crime a matter of extreme difficulty, and of comparatively rare occurrence. Again, bishops now-a-days have rarely to interfere in a judicial capacity in the affairs of laymen, their action being mostly confined to clerical cases. All this leads us to the inference that we are in presence of changed and particular conditions, and that the knowledge of a crime unaccompanied by defamation is now practically impossible and scarcely conceivable. But even admitting the possibility of the thing, there is no use in getting involved in a maze of useless and obsolete formalities, whose very reason for existence is greatly changed. For, in a word, what does our modern inquisitio come to? Simply, to a searching and secret examination into the truth or falsehood of an allegation made against an ecclesiastic. And, it is to be noted, that no matter how such prejudicial information be lodged, the bishop is bound to make an investigation, and to establish the facts. Such is the traditional practice sanctioned by custom, and confirmed by experience. Such now is the formal law embodied in the instruction "*Cum Magnopere*." The judge must collect evidence of every crime of which he is made cognizant. Taking into consideration the changed conditions of society, and admitting to the full the great wisdom of the ancient discipline, and the continuance of the spirit which actuated it, etc., we have no hesitation in seeing in the recent

instruction a modification of the texts given above from Innocent III., and similar sources. It need scarcely be said that even where the crime is sufficiently established, no bishop is going to hurry the opening of a trial. Far from it. The instruction which is his guide directs otherwise, and following it, the bishop will have recourse to entreaty, to friendly warnings, to commands, or to punishments, intended to change the heart of the culprit who may be often led astray, and a victim of weakness rather than a confirmed and hardened criminal, so that the cases will be rare where severe measures will have to be employed in consequence of formal judgment. We may then conclude that the circumstances entitling the accused to take advantage of a non-diffamatio before the opening of a trial are necessarily very few.

To avoid all equivocation, we would like to see a clearer distinction established between the ancient "*inquisitio specialis*" and modern judicial inquiry. We think that it is wrong to confound the two, although we admit a great analogy and similarity between them, especially in the method of proceeding. The preliminary proceedings which authors commonly call "*compilatio processus*" or "*processus informativus*", or again "*processus pro informatione criminis*", are really distinct from the ancient *inquisitio specialis*. The object of the former is to ascertain the solidity of the reasons authorizing criminal inquiry—this "*instructio processus*" is not the process itself. It took a long time to give definite expression to a distinction so easy, but it is in legal matters especially that men cling to forms even when the institutions underlying them are modified; so that the simplest thing to do is to admit a corresponding modification of procedure.

It is hardly possible for an attentive observer not to remark frequent breaches made in judicial theories. Reiffenstuel in his time, by a logical deduction drawn from the nature of the prosecutor's functions, made the following statement: "*Potest iudex nullâ præcedente infamiâ instituere inquisitionem specialem præviam denunciationem ministri seu officialis publici ad indaganda et demonstranda crimina ex officio delegati.*" His views were indeed, open to criticism, and objections apparently well grounded in his time were urged against him, but now, in the actual state of our laws, it seems hard not to adopt his opinions in consequence of the entirely changed procedure adopted by our judges. Pierantonelli brings out this point admirably when he says: "*die nostris inquisitio est actus extrajudicialis, nec pertinet ad processum judicalem, sed tantum inservire eidem potest . . . iudicis disciplinam antiquam, inquisitio erat remedium extraordinarium modo, ordinarium est.*" This change affecting the nature of *inquisitio* by extending it to all indictable cases, explains v

clearly the diminished importance of the *prævia diffamatio*. When we consider that all modern investigations are made in private, and all possible precautions are taken to guard against useless scandal, it will easily appear that the honor of an innocent man is not endangered, and hence that the most cogent arguments in favor of *diffamatio* are no longer available. The opening of an inquiry does not then demand at present reasons of such weighty moment as were formerly considered necessary, and in certain cases, vague, undefined suspicions are deemed sufficient.

We are forced to admit that these conclusions though appearing to us very reasonable and well grounded, are still open to discussion. And first of all, the recent documents nowhere directly declare that the old legislation of the decretals has become obsolete and consequently the commentaries of the ancient doctors unfounded and worthless. These reasons, and others which might be added, are not without their weight, but viewed in the light of a close study of the document of 1884 and the practical conclusions which follow from it, they do not seem of sufficient importance to counterbalance the necessity which is practically incumbent of following a totally different course. Is it, we ask, possible, that there is a promotor with well defined powers and official duties, but who is unable to act until public opinion and public talk have published to the world a scandal which it was his duty and within his power to prevent? This would be opposed to common sense and contrary to the natural conclusions drawn from the instruction we are studying. It is left to the bishop to determine when he should apply the remedies which the law puts at his disposal for the protection of ecclesiastical discipline and the safe guarding of Christian morality. There is no danger that the bishop may abuse his authority. Ordinary prudence, indeed, will dissuade him from having recourse to public measures when he may employ the equally efficacious extra-judicial remedy *ex informata conscientia*, and moreover, the occasion will very rarely occur when it will be necessary to open an inquiry where a *prævia diffamatio* does not already exist against the accused. Admitting however, such a possibility, we think that it would be extremely difficult for the defendant to have an unfavorable judgment reversed on the plea that a secret inquiry was made against him, although no previous diffamation existed. The text appears formal. "Processus ex officio instituitur. . . . nuncio quocumque modo ad curiam perlato." Moreover the investigation commenced by the bishop through the ordinary legal channels is different from the old *inquisitio specialis* and does not appear subject to the same regulations. And lastly, according to some writers even an injurious accusation and designation of "reus" justify

the opening of a special inquiry. We do not see how this conclusion can be avoided.

\* \* \* \* \*

With this established, we shall now give but a brief summary of the elements making up the judicial instruction. Its object is to establish the innocence or guilt of the accused. It is made up of two parts. The first or preliminary stage is carried out as far as possible without the knowledge of the accused. The actual verification of the crime should be corroborated by the formal declarations of witnesses, the instruments, if any, employed in the commission of the deed should be produced, all written documents pertinent to the case should be put in evidence, etc. Then the examining judge should bring together, study and compare the various charges and proofs before him, and if the complaint appears sufficiently sustained, he is empowered to summon the accused to explain or refute the allegations against him.

The great importance of this secret phase of the inquiry forbids us from attempting to deal with it here, especially as our article is exclusively intended to throw into relief *one* of the chief features of our modern judicial investigation.

G. PÉRIES, D.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON.

## THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SYRIAC GOSPELS.

THE briefest history of the discovery and transcription of the newly found Syriac Gospels is given on the title-page of their printed edition: "The four Gospels in Syriac transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by the late Robert L. Bensly, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and by J. Rendel Harris, Lecturer in Palæography in the University of Cambridge, and by F. Crawford Burkitt, M.A., with an Introduction by Agnes Smith Lewis; edited for the Syndics of the University Press; Cambridge, at the University Press, 1894." The introduction supplies the needed supplementary information. In the month of February, 1892, the Librarian Galaktion of the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, showed Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis among other Syriac MSS. one that attracted her attention by its look of venerable antiquity and by the fact that its leaves were glued together by age. The MS. proved to be a palimpsest, the upper writing of which contained mainly a martyrology, while the under or earlier one was identified with portions of the Synoptic Gospels. Mrs. Lewis, assisted by her sister, Mrs. Jane Young Gibson, photographed the whole MS., and in the month of July, 1892, Professor Bensly and Mr. F. C. Burkitt, succeeded in deciphering enough of the gospel-text to pronounce it nearly allied to the so-called Curetonian.<sup>1</sup> The two scholars continued to work at the photographs, but though they deciphered some thirty pages during the course of the autumn, they soon perceived that a direct inspection of the MS. was necessary. They were joined by Mr. J. Rendel Harris, who had discovered the Apology of Aristides in the same monastery during the year 1889. Galaktion who had in the meantime become Hegoumenos or abbot of the convent, received the party most hospitably, and delivered the Syriac MS. for the space of forty days (February 8 to March 20, 1893), into the hands of Mrs. Lewis, and it was during this period that her

<sup>1</sup> In the year 1842 Dr. Tattam brought to England from a Nitrian monastery a number of manuscripts, among which was one of the four Gospels. The manuscript proved to be heterogeneous, being composed of eighty-two and a half leaves of ancient writing, supplemented by others of more recent date, so as to form a complete volume of the Gospels. Dr. Cureton, then one of the officials of the British Museum, recognizing the superior age of the eighty-two and a half leaves, separated them from the rest, and after a careful examination was led to the conclusion that he had found fragments of a translation of the Gospels older than that contained in the Peshitto. —Cf. Gregory, *Prolegomena*, pp. 825 f.; *The Thinker*, January, 1895, p. 13.

three companions transcribed the Gospels. In the printed text the name of each transcriber is signified by his initials at the end of the pages for which he is responsible. Where the initials of the names appear, the page has been revised by two transcribers; where the names stand within brackets, the text has been revised from the photographs of Mrs. Lewis. The printed text reproduces that of the MS. line for line.

The palimpsest contained 182 leaves,  $8\frac{5}{8}$  inches by  $6\frac{1}{4}$ ; these leaves belonged to the original gospel MS, 4 copies of which were originally a Greek text of the fourth gospel, 24 showed signs of under writing, parts of Syriac apocrypha, and the remainder were originally a Greek MS. the contents of which have not yet been deciphered. The upper writing on all these leaves covers the space of one column of 26 lines to the page. It begins on the *verso* of the second leaf, or on the fourth page, with this preface to the martyrology: "By the strength of our Lord Jesus Christ [the Son of the living God, I begin, I the sinner, John the Recluse, of the desert of Mari Kaddish, to write select narratives about the holy virgins. First, the writings about the blessed Lady Thecla, disciple of the blessed apostle. Brethren, pray for me." After the narrative of Thecla follow sketches of Eugenia, Pelagia, Marinus, Euphrosinia, Onesima, Drusis, Barbara, Mary, Irene, Euphemia, Sophia, Theodosia, Theodota; then comes a profession of faith, then the life of Susanna, the life of Cyprian and Justa, and finally "the martyr in Paradise" from the writings of St. Ephrem. At the top of the *verso* of leaf 181 is the date of the upper writing; only a few words are at present legible: "The book was finished in the year of a thousand and nine . . . of Alexander the Macedonian [the son of Philip] . . . [in the month] Tammuz; on the third day of the month . . . may they be . . . who wrote the book of the Gospels yea and amen." The era of Alexander begins 312 B.C., so the foregoing date points to 687 A.D. But since the number of the MS. is followed by a hole, we must suppose that either [100] or in [the termination of the multiples of ten] has been omitted; hence the year becomes either 1900 or 1090. The former would correspond to A.D. 1588, a date that is wholly impossible; the latter coincides with A.D. 778, a year in keeping with the age of the original writing of the last twelve leaves in the palimpsest, which belongs to the eighth century. John the Recluse and his companions therefore have used the recently inscribed leaves of the Greek MS. to complete his martyrology.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Preface, xv.: Mrs. Lewis informs us that this part had evidently been written somewhat in the period between her two visits; the month of Tammuz is the Jewish mean month which nearly corresponds to our July.

The clause "of Beth-Mari Kaddish" which follows "John the Recluse" might lead one to suspect that the second or upper writing had its origin in the place of the foregoing name in Lebanon. But strong reasons militate against this assumption. First, in the profession of faith contained in the upper writing, Nestorius, Eutyches and Dioscorus are anathematized, so that the writing cannot have been done in Mesopotamia, Egypt, or the Jacobite regions of Syria. This leaves us upper Syria, Palestine and Sinai as possible homes of the palimpsest. Secondly, Mr. Harris gives good reasons for supposing that portions of the Syriac apocrypha which constitute the under, or earlier, writing of part of the palimpsest, are still extant in the Sinai library. Unless we assume, therefore, that the second writer did his work on Sinai, it is extremely difficult to account for the manner in which the stray leaves of the destroyed MS. of Syriac apocrypha found their way to the very same library in which their sister-leaves, written over by John the Recluse, had been deposited.<sup>1</sup> Beth-Mari Kaddish may have been the native place of John, or of his parents, so that this addition to his name cannot astonish us, even if he did not write in his native place.

Thus far we have examined the upper writing of the palimpsest, not thoroughly, but sufficiently for our purpose. We come now to the principal object of our study, or that portion of the under, or earlier, writing which contains the gospel-text. It has already been stated that only 142 leaves of the palimpsest belong to the original gospel-volume. It can be ascertained that the latter consisted in its primitive form of 17 quires; 14 of these were quinions, *i.e.*, consisted of 10 leaves each, but the sixth, fifteenth and sixteenth contained only eight leaves each. The whole volume contained therefore 164 leaves; since 142 are preserved in the palimpsest, only 22 have been lost. But five of these, the first two and the last three, contained no portions of the gospels, so that only 17 gospel-leaves are lost. It must, however, be added that portions of the preserved leaves are illegible, and remained so, even on application of hydrosulphide of ammonia which the monks allowed the transcribers to make use of. The original writing is in two columns, with an uncertain number of lines in each. There are no lines ruled for the text, though vertical ones existed on the side of each page. The second writer did not follow the order of pages of the gospel-manuscript, but tore out the leaves at random, and supplied a new order of pages. The final colophon reads: "Here ends the gospel of the Mēpharrēshē, four books (or writers): glory to God and to his Christ and to his Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Preface, xvi., xvii.



Let every one that reads and hears and observes and does for the sinner that wrote it, that God may have mercy on him and remit him his sins in both worlds. Amen and amen."<sup>1</sup> This was followed on the same page by a column of writing not yet deciphered. It contains, no doubt, important items concerning the history of the MS.—perhaps its date. As it is, Mr. Harris, in the November number of the *Contemporary Review*, supposes that the Syriac gospel was written in the fifth century, and is a tolerably accurate copy of a translation dating back to the second century.

The peculiarities of the Syriac gospels may be reduced to three points: First, they omit those parts that are omitted in other ancient manuscripts; such are the story of the adulterous woman, John vii., 53–viii., 11; the end of the second gospel, Mk., xvi., 7–ff.; the mention of the bloody sweat, Lk., xxii., 43, 44; the prayer of Jesus for his executioners, Lk., xxiii., 34; the statement that the inscription on the cross was in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, Lk., xxiii., 38b; the words "and was carried up to heaven," Lk., xxiii., 51b. Besides, there are a few omissions that are peculiar to the Syriac MS.: The mocking of Jesus before Herod, together with the immediate context, Lk., xxiii., 10–12; the fact that Jesus showed his disciples his hands and feet after the resurrection, Lk., xxiv., 40. Secondly, the Syriac MS. is free from acknowledged interpolations such as characterize other MSS., e.g., the cod. Bezae; it is, therefore, rather remarkable for its agreement with the Vatican cod. Thirdly, in spite of this general agreement with other MSS. the Sinaitic MS. presents readings numerous and peculiar enough to give it a special character. We shall state them in order, beginning, however, those of the first chapter of Matthew for the present paragraph.<sup>2</sup>

Mt. iii., 11, reads, "he shall baptize you in fire and in the Holy Ghost," instead of "he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire." Mt. xiii., 48, the fish taken out of the net to be preserved are described as *very* good. Mt. xviii., 20, the Lord's promise of his presence is expressed in the negative form: "There are not two or three gathered together in my name, and I not among them." The cod. Bezae has the same reading. Mt. xviii., 22, the duty of unlimited forgiveness is expressed thus: "Not seven, but until seventy times seven seven," a reading supported by both Peshitto and Curetonian text. Mt. xxi., 31, 32 present more remarkable variations. To the question of our Lord, "Who of the two did the father's will?" the chief priests and scribes answer, "the last," as we read in B. and D.,<sup>3</sup> instead of "the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Preface, xx.

<sup>2</sup> Many of these readings have been noted in *The Thinker*, April, 1895, pp.

<sup>3</sup> The Vatican cod., and the cod. Bezae.

In Christ's answer, the Sinaitic MS. omits the negative particle, so that we read: "And you seeing it, at last repented that you might believe on him"; the chief priests and the ancients of the people are represented as going into the kingdom of God, but after the publicans and harlots. Mt. xxv., 1, the ten virgins taking their lamps, "went out to meet the bridegroom *and the bride*," just as we read in D., the Diatessaron as edited by Ciasca, the Peshitto, a later Syriac version [White], certain codd. of the Itala, the Latin Vulgate, the Armenian version, etc.<sup>1</sup> But the fact that "and the bride" is omitted in the best codd., and that it does not well agree with vv. 5, 6, 10, shows the spuriousness of the clause. Mt. xxvii., 17, gives the question of Pilate in a most striking manner: "Whom will you that I release to you, *Jesus Barab-bas*, or Jesus that is called Christ?"

The following are the principal peculiar readings in the second gospel: Mk. vi., 20, states that Herod Antipas did many things which he heard from the Baptist: "And many things that he heard from him he did, and heard him gladly." This reading is pronounced genuine by Knabenbauer,<sup>2</sup> on account of its difficulty. Mk. vii., 26, the Syro-Phœnician woman is described as a widow. Mk. ix., 26, the lunatic child healed after our Lord's transfiguration, was not only "lifted up" by Jesus, but also delivered to his father. In a similar way, our Lord gave back the widow's son to his mother after raising him to life (Lk. vii., 15). Mk. ix., 35 f. reads, "and he took a certain child, and set him in the midst of them, and looked at him and said to them," instead of, "and taking a child, he set him in the midst of them; whom when he had embraced, he saith to them." Mk. x., 17, the rich ruler accosts Jesus whilst the latter was on a journey, not "when he was gone forth into the way." Mk. x., 50, the blind Bartimeus, or Bar-Timai, as the Syriac gives the name, "took up his garment" when he rose and went to Jesus, instead of "casting off his garment"; Mrs. Lewis appeals to Eastern habits as favoring the Syriac reading.

The Syriac variations are more numerous in the third gospel. Lk. x., 41 f., where our Lord rebukes Martha for "being troubled about many things," the Sinaitic MS. omits "but one thing is necessary," so that the rebuke is much gentler than in the Received Text. In Lk. x., 35, the good Samaritan leaves the inn "at the dawn of day." Lk. xi., 5, the man who asks for bread at midnight introduces his petition with the words, "my friend." Lk. xv., 13, the prodigal son lives "wastefully with harlots," while according to the Received Text he "wasted his substance, living

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Knabenbauer, *in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> *In loc.*

riotously." Lk. xv., 30, the elder brother, speaking to the father after the return of the prodigal, rebukes him for killing "a fattened calf." Lk. xvi., 20, the Lazarus of the parable is described as a poor man. Lk. xvi., 22, the rich man is "cast into hell," instead of being buried in hell. Lk. xviii., 5, the unjust judge is afraid of the widow, lest she should "come and *take hold of his leg*." Lk. xx., 58, Peter accompanies one of his denials with the words "let me alone." Lk. xxiii., 9, omits the account of the mocking by Herod, as we have seen already. The hearing is described thus: "Then he questioned him in *cunning* words, but Jesus turned him no answer." Lk. xxiii., 37, the crown of thorns worn on the cross, a point that is left doubtful in the Received Text.

The peculiar readings of the fourth gospel are more numerous than those in any of the first three. John iii., 5, reverses the order of water and the Spirit in our spiritual birth, to "the Spirit and water"; but in verse 8, the words "of water" are prefixed to the clause "of the Spirit," just as we read in the Curetonian, while the Received Text omits "of water" in verse 8. John iv., 14, reads, "and the reaper *straightway* receiveth wages," so that spiritual sowing is declared to be immediately followed by reaping. John v., 21, substitutes "even so the Son raiseth up them who believe in Him," for "the Son also giveth life to whom he will." The Curetonian text agrees with the Sinaitic. John vi., 29, Mary the sister of Lazarus "went *eagerly* to Jesus when she had received the message"; in verse 39, Martha asks a question that occurs nowhere else, "why shall they take away this stone?" According to John xii., 3, Mary poured the ointment on our Lord's head before anointing his feet; this may have been introduced from the first and second gospel.<sup>1</sup> In John xiv., 6, we have the emphatic statement, "I, I am the way, and the truth and the life"; in verse 27 of the same chapter our Lord says, "My *own* peace I give unto you." A few verses before this [xiv., 22] it is not Judas, as in the Received Text, but Thomas who asks the question: "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to me and not to the world?" John xviii., 3, attests that the party going to arrest Jesus included some of the chief priests and Pharisees; the Received Text knows only of servants of the chief priests and Pharisees. According to John xx., 8, Peter and John were believed, when they had seen the empty sepulchre. John xx., 17, tells us that Mary Magdalene *ran towards* the risen Lord, that she might touch him. Finally, in John xxi., 7, Peter swam to shore after the second miraculous draught of fishes.

<sup>1</sup> Mt., xxvi., 7; Mk., xiv., 3.

Interesting as all the variations of the Sinaitic MS. may be, they do not approach in importance the apparently systematic variations found in the first chapter of St. Matthew.

Verse 16.—Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus. . . .

Verse 21.—She shall bear *thee* a son. . . .

Verse 25.—And she bare *him* a son, and *he* called his name Jesus.

Besides, verse 25 omits "and he knew her not till." Obviously, these readings appear to maintain that our Lord was born according to the ordinary course of nature. If this view could be sustained, the whole question would be an extremely simple one; the text would represent the heretical view of an early Syriac sect, and would have been changed according to the needs of its supporters. But on closer inspection, the whole passage, from verse 16 to 25, insists most emphatically on the virginal conception of our Lord; Mary is found with child of the Holy Ghost [v. 18]; Joseph is troubled, and minded to put Mary away secretly [19]; he is reassured by the angel, and the prophecy of Isaias about the Virgin Mother [20 ff.]; Mary is explicitly called "the Virgin" in the Sinaitic text, though the Received Text speaks of her without that epithet [16]. Hence the problem of the Sinaitic variations has become a rather complicated one, which has found different solutions by different writers.

1. All seem to agree that the Sinaitic text represents a very early Syriac version. E. Nestle<sup>1</sup> words his conclusion thus: "Among all the versions of the New Testament, that contained in the Lewis MS. stands nearest in time and place to the original gospel-text." Mr. Harris<sup>2</sup> is of opinion that the Syriac translation of the gospels either in its very source or near the same showed the form represented by the Sinaitic text. Mr. R. H. Charles<sup>3</sup> believes that the Lewis MS. represents Joseph as the natural father of our Lord, and that this text has served as the basis of the old Latin and the Armenian translation. Mr. F. C. Conybeare<sup>4</sup> is fully convinced that the Sinaitic text is no corruption of the original text of the gospel. The "*a priori*" reasons peculiar to these writers we shall have occasion to consider later. Their arguments based on objective ground, may be reduced to the following:

*a.* All the old Syriac texts that have come to light, show either an unorthodox text or at least vestiges of a correction of the same. The first Syriac gospel-text must therefore have been unorthodox.

<sup>1</sup> *Theol. Literatur Zeitg.*, 1894, p. 626 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Contemporary Review*, Nov., 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *Academy*, 1894, ii., p. 447 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Academy*, Nov. 17, Dec. 22, 1894.

Not to insist on the inconclusiveness of the inference, we may ask Mr. Harris for his proof of the first statement. The Curetonian text, as we are informed<sup>1</sup> is a correction of an unorthodox text, because of its eagerness to establish the virginity of Mary, it goes to the extreme of changing several ambiguous words that are found even in the orthodox text. In verse 19 it reads; "Joseph" instead of "Joseph her husband"; in verse 20 it has "fear not to take unto thee Mary thy espoused" instead of "Mary thy wife"; in verse 21 it substitutes "took Mary" instead of "took unto him his wife"; in verse 25 it has "and he lived with her in purity" instead of "and he knew her not." According to the citation of St. Ephrem Tatian's Diatessaron had adopted this last reading also. Whether these facts show that the Curetonian and the Diatessaron correspond to the Lewis text, or *vice versa*, we shall see below.

b. The Ferrar group,<sup>2</sup> the Armenian version, and the old Latin texts represented by the codd. Bobbiensis,<sup>3</sup> Veronensis,<sup>4</sup> Colbertinus,<sup>5</sup> Bezae,<sup>6</sup> Sangermanensis,<sup>7</sup> Frisingensis,<sup>8</sup> and Vercellensis,<sup>9</sup> all derived from the Syriac version, and show orthodox emendations of the heterodox text. We readily grant that these Latin texts show signs of derivation from the Syriac; all except one read, *et* Mary . . . . begat, instead of Mary bare . . . . which is best explained by the double meaning [*gignere* and *parere*, to beget and to bear] of the Syriac verb "*iled*"—but whether they are derived from the orthodox or the unorthodox Syriac text, is not determined thereby. Since their form is so similar to the Curetonian that the agreement can hardly be ascribed to mere accident, we naturally infer that they are versions of the orthodox Syriac text. And if this be the case, they do not settle the question whether the primitive Syriac gospel-version was orthodox or heterodox.<sup>10</sup>

c. Another argument for the early date of the Sinaitic MS., rather for the Syriac gospel-version contained in it, is based on the double fact that on the part of the Catholics the gospel was explained as to maintain the perpetual virginity of Mary [by Chrysostom and Severus, *e.g.*], while on the part of heretics the testimony of the gospels was appealed to against the dogma of Mary's virginity. Mr. Harris's appeal to the method of Justin's apology is hardly conclusive on this point. The testimony of Epiphanius [Haer., xxx., 14], is more relevant: "The Cerinthians," Epiphanius says, "make use of St. Matthew's gospel as t

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, l. c.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gregory, ii., p. 462, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Of the fifth century; Gregory, iii., 960.

<sup>4</sup> Of the fifth century; Gregory, iii., 954.

<sup>5</sup> Of the twelfth century.

<sup>6</sup> Of the sixth century.

<sup>7</sup> Of the eighth century.

<sup>8</sup> Of the sixth century.

<sup>9</sup> Of the fourth century.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift*, 1895, ii., p. 3.

Ebionites do, on account of *the human genealogy*, though their copy is not entire. . . . " The Adoptionists too, add some weight to this argument, because they appealed to the history of our Lord's baptism as proving their position. Now John, i., 34, of the Lewis MS. reads: "I saw and bare record that this is the *chosen* [not the Son] of God." Their fourth gospel must therefore have resembled that preserved in the Syriac text of Sinai. Not to burden this proof with Mr. Harris's allegation of several Latin MSS., it must be remembered that we freely admit that the Lewis gospels contain a text which may easily be interpreted in a heretical way; but the point at issue is the priority of this text as compared with other Syriac texts, especially the Curetonian. The arguments thus far advanced prove the existence of the Sinaitic text before the time of the foregoing heresies, perhaps before the time of the cited old Latin versions, but not before the origin of the Curetonian version.

2. The writers on the present subject do not agree in their explanation of the text-problem that is found in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

a. Mr. Charles<sup>1</sup> unravels the knot by cutting it. Both the genealogy of Matthew and of Luke—in this latter, Mr. Charles identifies the clause "who was called the son of Joseph" with "who was the son of Joseph"—are written from an Ebionite point of view. Considering the fact that Tatian omits the genealogy, that Justin does not refer to it, that in several MSS. verse 18 begins with a capital letter, and that some add, in the margin, the rubric "incipit evangelium secundum Matthæum," or "genealogia hucusque, incipit evangelium . . ." the learned writer infers that the genealogy of the first gospel was added to the Greek MSS. about 170 A.D. Besides, in the genealogy of the Lewis MS., "we have exactly what one would expect to find in a genealogy of Joseph." But not one of these arguments can bear examination; the last remark is an *a priori* consideration; Tatian did not intend to copy the gospels, but to write a life of Jesus Christ according to the gospel-record; it cannot be expected of every apologist that he should make use of the whole gospel, so that Justin's omission does not prove much; the accompaniments of verse 18 have been repeatedly explained more satisfactorily than they have been by Mr. Charles; finally, the Ebionites were so far from appealing to the genealogy of the first gospel, that they omitted the first two chapters entirely, and began their gospel of Matthew with the ministry of the Baptist.<sup>2</sup> Conybeare<sup>3</sup> ends his refutation of Mr. Charles's

<sup>1</sup> Academy, December 1, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Epiph., adv. haer., xxix., 9; xxx., 13; *Les Études*, Janvier, 1895, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> Academy, December 8, 1894.

view with the words : " When Mr. Charles mutilates a text usually accounted sacred, he is in danger of falling into the predicament of the Chinaman who burned down his house in order to roast pig."

b. Mr. Conybeare himself has not been successful in roasting the pig without falling into the Chinaman's error. According to him,<sup>1</sup> " the genealogy finds its only logical and possible conclusion in the new form of verse 16." " This," he believes, " all parties will admit." The Lewis text is no corruption of an original orthodox text. The Sinaitic MS. represents, therefore, rather an attempted orthodox alteration of a primitive heretical version *vice versa*. But what is to be said of the statement that Mary was found by Joseph with child of the Holy Ghost [18], that Joseph was minded to put Mary away secretly, and retained her only when he was reassured by an angel [19-20], that Mary is called " the Virgin " [16] ? The facility with which Conybeare overcomes all these difficulties has rightly been styled enviable by one of our critics.

According to Philo,<sup>2</sup> the human soul comes directly from God; hence, " the Jews in the time of Christ deemed it possible and natural for a child to be conceived of the Holy Spirit, and yet at the same time to be begotten in the ordinary way. The two processes lay in different spheres. The one gave his soul or reason, which was a gift of the divine spirit, the other process gave his flesh, blood, and faculties of the sense."<sup>3</sup> A similar view, Conybeare finds in the works of Philo,<sup>4</sup> where the wives of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are said to be virtues; they are said to have conceived of God, and to have borne sons to the patriarchs. " So it is," the writer infers, " that the angel assures Joseph that Mary has conceived the future Messiah of the Holy Spirit, and yet, in the same breath, bids him take his wife to himself and produce the Messiah in the usual way. To the mind of Philo and his contemporaries there was nothing in such a command that was inconsistent and irreligious."<sup>5</sup> Not to insist on the fact that according to this explanation, the phrase, " to conceive of the Holy Spirit," meant nothing extraordinary at all, and is, therefore, needless urged by the evangelist; that again, Philo's allegory has nothing in common with the natural process of generating children; we must point out that the gospel-text is not at all satisfied by the solution given. Where is the cause of Joseph's anxiety and doubt? why does he wish to dismiss Mary? surely, the cause

<sup>1</sup> Academy, November 17, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> Academy, November 17, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> Academy, p. 401, col. 1, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> De officio mundi, I. 32, 40.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. de Cherub., 13.

ception of the Messiah's soul would not have caused the outward signs of pregnancy. And what about the visit of the angel? his joyful prediction of the birth of a son? To say, with Conybeare, that verses 19 and 20, in which all this is contained, are interpolations of carnally minded persons, incapable of understanding the spiritual meaning of the passage, is to acknowledge the impossibility of reconciling the theory of Conybeare with the present text of the Lewis MS. And if we must have recourse to mutilation of the text in order to effect the reconciliation, we fall into the mistake of the Chinaman. The suggestion of Badham<sup>1</sup> does not remedy this inconvenience. "The narratives of Virgin-birth," the writer thinks, "do not necessarily exclude St. Joseph altogether. It is only stated that Christ's birth was not due to any action or volition of his Mother's husband. When the rib was taken from Adam's side, Adam was unconscious." Though Simcox<sup>2</sup> finds this explanation "just as probable and just as edifying," it does not add anything to the solution of the problem involved in the Sinaitic gospel-text. If Joseph has taken, even unconsciously, part in the generation of Jesus, why should the angel tell him that the child was conceived of the Holy Spirit rather than of his natural father? Besides, the whole explanation is a pure hypothesis, advanced for the sole purpose of bolstering up the naturalism of the rationalists.

We need not add Conybeare's explanation of the addition "the Virgin" in verse 16; first, the addition is generally regarded as not genuine, since it would be difficult to account for its omission in all Greek codd. Secondly, Conybeare's explanation would deserve attention only if his solution of the problem were satisfactory; as it is, this minor point is buried in the ruin of his theory. Thirdly, Acts, vi., 1., Tertullian<sup>3</sup>, Clement of Alexandria<sup>4</sup>, and Ignatius<sup>5</sup>, show only that the particular writers considered widowhood in certain cases equal to virginity; but they do not prove that widows were generally called virgins in the earliest age of the Church; to explain, therefore, the addition "the Virgin" in verse 16 by recurring to these passages, is an open acknowledgement of one's incompetency to reconcile the addition with the rest of the passage.

c. According to Harris<sup>6</sup>, the Lewisian text is at the same time heretically corrupted and prior to the Curetonian. Mr. Harris gives a diagram showing the relation of the Sinai MS. to the other codd.: on the one side we have the genuine primitive reading as

<sup>1</sup> Academy, November 17, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> Academy, November 24, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> De Exh. Cast., i.

<sup>4</sup> Strom., vii., 12.

<sup>5</sup> ad Smyrn., 13; cf. Lightfoot, Apostol. Fathers, ii., 324.

<sup>6</sup> *Contemporary Review*, November, 1894.



preserved in the bulk of the best MSS., on the other a heretofore unaccounted corruption of the primitive text. The corrupted text has come down to us in two ways: in its unaltered corrupted form and in its excessive orthodox emendation. The Lewis MS. is a representative of the former, the Curetonian, the Diatessaron of Tatian, the Armenian version, the MSS. of the Ferrar group and the old Latin MSS. cited above, are exponents of the latter. Mr. Allen<sup>1</sup> is of opinion that no other hypothesis but that of the originality of the Lewis reading will satisfactorily account for the discrepancy on the one hand of the Received Text and on the other of the Curetonian and old Latin version of verse 16<sup>2</sup>.

It is true that Mr. Harris's theory does not violate any doctrine of faith; nor does it favor the rationalist school in their defense of naturalism. But it supposes a stupidity on the part of the scribes who corrupted the text that cannot be imputed to them unless a solid proof be given for it. It would surely be absurd to change a few words in three verses and leave unchanged three or four entire verses which directly contradict the opinion intended to be established by the textual corruption. Moreover, the falsification would have added "the Virgin" in verse 16, thus deliberately weakening their own position. That Mr. Allen's contention concerning the derivation of the Received Text and of the old Latin and Curetonian from the Lewisian is groundless, we shall see presently.

d. The seeming contradiction in the first chapter of the gospel of St. Matthew in the Lewisian text is, after all, most satisfactorily explained by a writer in the "London Tablet."<sup>3</sup> The text is heretical but orthodox. That the virginal conception of Jesus was emphatically taught in the Sinaitic MS. has already been shown by the expressions "Joseph . . . begat Jesus" (16), "she shall bear thee a son" (21), "and she bare him a son, and he called his name Jesus" (25), are easily explained if we remember that Joseph was legally the father of Jesus. Joseph is therefore represented as the father of Jesus in the same sense in which Luke ii., 33, 48 calls him the father of our Lord. If we remember that the phrase "to raise up seed to his brother" was used in connection with the law of the Levirate, it will appear less incredible than it otherwise might, that the verb "begat" should be used of legal, not of physical fatherhood.

The orthodox character of the Lewis text once admitted, its origin is not hard to account for. First, the Curetonian and dependent Latin versions are derived from the received text.

<sup>1</sup> Academy, December 15, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *London Tablet*, January 5, 1895.

<sup>3</sup> January 5, pp. 8f.

omission of "her husband" in verse 19, of "his wife" in verse 24, by changing the "husband of Mary" to "Joseph to whom was espoused" in verse 16, and finally by substituting "Mary thy espoused" in verse 20 instead of "Mary thy wife." These changes of the original text are the more probable, because the Curetonian may be supposed to have served in parts of the Church where, on account of the errors of Cerinthus, Carpocrates and similar heretics, Christians were apt to understand the genealogy in too naturalistic a sense. Verse 16 of the Curetonian reads then "Jacob begat Joseph, him to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, she who bare (or begat) Jesus."

Secondly, substitute in this reading "Joseph" for the pronoun "him," and omit "she who" in conformity with the preceding members of the genealogy, and we obtain the Lewis reading "Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus." If we remember that the scribe may have been a Jewish Christian fully familiar with legal paternity, and habituated to express the relations between legal father and son in the same terms as those between natural father and son, the foregoing changes contain little or nothing strange. Whether they were made consciously or unconsciously, they did not convey to the writer or the intended reader any doctrine concerning Mary's virginity, different from that maintained in the Curetonian gospel-text. This derivation of the Lewis text from the Curetonian is confirmed by the following fact.<sup>1</sup> The printed text of the Sinai MS. shows a punctuation that is wholly abnormal in the changed form of the text, but fits exactly in the Curetonian reading. Must we not then infer that the scribe has changed the wording of the text according to the foregoing suggestion, but retained its punctuation? A glance at the two texts renders this clear: "Jacob begat Joseph Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin. begat Jesus." The Curetonian reads: "Jacob begat Joseph, him to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, she who bare Jesus." The stop after "Virgin" in the former text is wholly meaningless, and cannot be understood unless we suppose that it has been retained from a primitive text like the Curetonian in which it had its proper meaning. It is true that in the present Curetonian MS. no stop is found after Virgin, but the MS. must not be identified with the text it represents, especially since the system of punctuation "which very intermittently prevails in the two Old Syriac MSS." demands a stop after "virgin." Moreover, the omission of "and he knew her not until" in verse 25 is certainly a corruption of the text, since this clause is found in every known MS. except the cod.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *London Tablet*, January 5, 9, col. 1.

Bobbiensis. Of the colometry, too, or the division of the text into short sense-lines, which Mr. Harris believes to have been partially preserved by the cod. Bezae, and the Curetonian and Lewis MSS., the traces in the last-named are much scarcer than in that of Cureton. All these details go far to show that the scribe of the Sinai MS. was not very particular about reproducing an exact copy, and render it therefore antecedently probable that the changes in the genealogy are attributable to him also.

As we have a number of MSS. preserving the variations of the Latin translation before the time of the Hieronymian Latin Vulgate, so we may regard the Curetonian and the Lewis MSS. as preserving variations of the Syriac version before the Syriac Vulgate or Peshitto came into general use. And though we cannot accept the ancient Syriac text on its own merit alone, without subjecting it to a close cross-examination, the Council of Trent urges us not to dismiss these old readings off hand and without giving them a proper hearing. For the Council declares the books of Holy Scripture as sacred and canonical in their integrity, and, however, two conditions: 1. "As they are wont to be read in the Catholic Church." 2. "As they are had in the old Latin Vulgate edition." Since then the Syriac Church, even before adopting the Peshitto version as its Vulgate, was part of the "Ecclesia catholica," the words of the Council impel us to a serious study of the MSS. containing the Scripture versions then used by the fathers. They may not be the light, but they are "to give testimony to the light." [*Cf.* John, i., 8.]

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

## CONTROVERSY IN HIGH PLACES.

THE diocese of Salford, in England, is included in the diocese of Manchester. But the diocese of Salford is Catholic, and the diocese of Manchester is Protestant. The two "bishops" have recently been in conflict. Dr. Moorhouse, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, publicly attacked the Catholic Church, and Dr. Billsborrow, the Catholic Bishop of Salford, publicly replied to Dr. Moorhouse. Both prelates delivered lectures to crowded audiences from the pulpits of their respective cathedrals. These lectures have since been published in pamphlet form. They treat chiefly of the subject of authority, very little being said about doctrine.

It would be difficult to compress the arguments of the combatants, and impossible to do so with justice. It is more to the point that we try to state their general principles, their starting-points and moods of disputation. The "challenge," which was contained in the Anglican bishop's first lecture, was summed up in the following sentence: that "the Roman claims necessitated a proof of the three following propositions: first, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; second, that his prerogative of infallibility was held by him as bishop and not merely as apostle; and third, that his infallibility was in such sort attached to his office that it descended necessarily to all his successors in the Roman See." This challenge, with the Catholic bishop's reply, has been published in London and Manchester, and any one who desires to study the controversy will derive a vast amount of information.

But what we would do now is to study, not the details of the controversy—this would be a task of great length—but the principles on which both sides are argued, and the "spirit of faith" which is apparent. Throughout the whole of the controversy these principles and this spirit peep out, as it were, "between the lines." We feel that while we are discussing the "Petrine Claims," we are really watching the "good will" of the writers, and our conclusions are less drawn from the thrust and parry of the combatants than from the "attitude of mind" which is discernible. It is this attitude we should like now to contemplate. And we shall try first to sketch the polemical pose of Dr. Moorhouse with as much of distinctness as may be possible. Though the main question is the centre of authority, authority itself is the real point. Not so much "is there supreme living authority?" as "is

there any living authority at all?" is the question which is being argued. And the conclusion which forces itself upon us is that Anglicanism is a repudiation of living authority, and simply a repudiation of the Holy See.

The Catholic reader of the lectures of Dr. Moorhouse finds himself, as he turns over the pages, musing disturbedly in this fashion: Dr. Moorhouse seems to say that there are, necessarily, truths, but that there is no living teacher to define them; he seems to say that there is, necessarily, authority, but that it is impossible to be sure where it resides. He seems to say that there are heresies and schisms, but that no one can define or can prevent them. He rejects the teaching authority of the Supreme Pontiff but asserts his own authority to teach him. He proclaims that obedience is a Christian virtue, but limits its exercise to egotism. He abhors apostacy as one of the great sins, but denies that there is a high priest to judge it. He thinks that unity is a good thing for Christian souls, but affirms that it should be a unity of different opinions. He acknowledges that Almighty God is One, but pronounces His religion should be various.

Pages would not suffice for the enumeration of the fallacies which result from the attitude of Dr. Moorhouse. It has been well said, "you cannot reduce religion to a syllogism"; it would be absurd to say, "there are no such things as first principles in the exercise of authority or obedience." First principles are the essentials of religion, and the first of first principles are to know "whom do I obey," and "why do I not obey myself?" Dr. Moorhouse cannot answer such questions. He has a hazardous notion that Christian doctrines are divine only in the sense which is known to the mind of God, but human in the sense known to man, revelation having been a hint only of divine truths, which were not meant to be believed but opinionized. This hazardous conclusion follows necessarily from the rejection of a living authority as the source of doctrine; for to say that every man is capable of creating a doctrine for himself out of his own private interpretation of the Bible is to affirm that every intellect is endowed with infallibility, and every soul with the fulness of divine grace. And to shift the position to "obedience to primitive teaching" is equally disastrous to common sense; for it is no more possible for every man and woman to master the whole of primitive teaching than to master themselves of the occult, religious practices of the fugitives in the catacombs of Rome. In the very fact that Dr. Moorhouse disputes with Dr. Billsborrow as to the interpretation to be put upon early writings, he concedes the fact that the interpretation of the Fathers is as difficult as the interpretation of the Scriptures. To be obliged to dispute about authority and doctrine is to

that there is no certainty as to either; just as, conversely, a Catholic never disputes about either, because divine faith gives the knowledge of both.

Let us call Dr. Benson to our aid, so as to strengthen the position of Dr. Moorhouse. Dr. Benson is Archbishop of Canterbury, and he has recently declared in a public utterance that Rome ought to conform to modern England, and not modern England to Rome. "If," said his Grace, "the Pope chooses to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, we will come to an agreement with him. If not, no." And he said also that there "could be no reunion between the Established Church and the Church of Rome until the latter had abandoned her errors." Here we have the assertion (1) that the teaching authority of the Established Church is superior to the teaching authority of the Church of Rome; and (2) that by that superiority the Established Church rules that the Roman Catholic Church teaches errors. Let us examine these two candid assertions. We shall be criticising Dr. Moorhouse at the same time.

Now (1) if the teaching authority of the Established Church be superior to the teaching authority of the Church of Rome, on what basis does it rest its superiority? The authority to teach truths must come either from dispensation or from a commission which no Christian can dispute. Does the Christian dispensation, do the Gospels or Epistles, contain one word which would justify the assertion that the modern Church of England should teach the world? Where are the promises to the so-called Church of England? Where are the promises to Dr. Benson or Dr. Moorhouse, to the Committee of the Privy Council, or to the Convocation? There are none. But say that the authority was given by a divine favor in the time of Henry VIII. or Queen Elizabeth. We do not find anything in the character of those two monarchs which would justify a belief in their apostolicity. This may seem to be a playful view of the subject, but it is, on the contrary, a most stern, a most grave one. It is the very kernel of the whole question; it must be answered. The Church of Rome is called upon by Dr. Benson, and equally by the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, to submit to the superior authority of their Establishment. Why? What credentials can the Establishment show to us? We all know the credentials of the Church of Rome. "Thou art Peter," was the conferring of credentials, which even the mind of a child could understand. But neither in the Bible, nor in tradition, nor in primitive teaching, nor in all history, can we discover even a hint of the divine authority of that institution which was founded by Queen Elizabeth's Acts of Parliament. "Quis te misit, Dr. Benson?" Dr. Moorhouse has not attempted to enlighten us.

But (2) the superiority of the teaching authority of Dr. Benson gives him power to affirm, as it were pontifically, that the Roman Catholic Church "teaches errors." Let us accept the assertion and try the consequences. The Catholic Church teaches errors, but the Protestant Establishment does not. At least we must assume so, because, if the Establishment taught errors, the Archbishop of Canterbury would anathematize them. More than the Archbishop of Canterbury, being endowed with a teaching divine authority which is superior to that of the Supreme Pontiff, would define (and with more exactness than does the Pontiff) the truth to be believed by all Anglicans. Has he done so? He has ruled, say, the true doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, in contradiction to the various heresies of his countrymen? On the contrary, he has advised "peace" between heretics, and a harmonious comminglement of their "errors." Then since the Archbishop of Canterbury approves of "errors" in his own church; recommends amiability between such clergy and such peoples as hold opposite doctrines; positively declines—though professedly competent—to define truths, or to anathematize so much as one hundred "errors"; we may ask with what consistency can we demand of the Supreme Pontiff that he should submit himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Infallibility? The Supreme Pontiff according to the ruling of Dr. Benson, teaches errors to all Catholics in the world, and so far he asserts his teaching power; but the Archbishop of Canterbury is so helpless that he cannot teach anything at all, except the duty of *not* caring about errors. If we had to choose between two teachers; the one who said, "I anathematize errors, and can and will teach you divine truths," and the other said, "I have no power to teach you truths, and can only advise you to try to harmonize errors"; even if we did not accept the first, we should say to the second, "you confess yourself to be a non-Christian teacher."

But Dr. Moorhouse, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, is responsible for the weakness of his primate, he is only responsible for himself. Now in what position does Dr. Moorhouse find himself, in his relation to the Archbishop of Canterbury? Does he obey him in doctrinal definition? Certainly not. He would care more for his ruling on any one doctrine of the faith than he would care for that of any curate in his diocese. Then for whose ruling does he care? Supposing that the two Houses of Convocation were to meet in sacred conclave to-morrow, and were to define a doctrine, say, of the sacramental real presence, would the Bishop of Manchester implicitly accept the definition, provided the Archbishop of Canterbury endorsed it? He would care no more for such fantastic promulgation than he would care for a decree

his butler. He knows that the "opinions" of his right reverend brethren are the results of individual bias; and that they would not have even a foundation of truth in them, except for what has been learned from the Catholic Church. Then to whom does he look for definition? Not to the Supreme Pontiff, for he disowns him. Not to general councils, for he claims the right to choose their number, and their value as œcumenically binding; and, further still, claims the right to interpret all their teachings, without reference to any living authority. Not to any written ruling of primitive authority would Dr. Moorhouse yield implicit obedience, nor to any audible voice of living authority in the whole world, except on the condition that his own personal *placet* should ratify the authoritative decision. Here then we have a "Popery" which, while being confessedly Protestant, is confessedly fatal to all authority. It has been humorously observed that, in the Protestant rule of faith, every one is infallible except the Pope; but the assertion is too generous, for really no one is infallible except he happens to agree with the *egomet*. Dr. Moorhouse would acknowledge the inerrancy of Dr. Benson, provided Dr. Benson agreed with him; and Dr. Benson would return the compliment to Dr. Moorhouse, on the same somewhat restricted understanding. So that when we are reading such "teachings" of Dr. Benson as have been quoted in an earlier page, or such controversial egotism as we find in the lectures which have been published by the Bishop of Manchester, we naturally ask ourselves, whom do these gentlemen obey, what or where is their *Ecclesia Docens*? It is not the Bible, for they interpret it for themselves, and make it "teach" whatever doctrines they prefer. As to the Anglican formularies—which fifty years ago meant "rank Protestantism," but are said now to mean ritualism or "quasi Romanism"—they make no claim to teach anything but compromise, and have been an admirable success in that character. As to the Thirty-Nine Articles, which an Anglican clergyman, Mr. Byrne, has described as "a farrago of nonsense," they were drawn up expressly to "catch all fish except Papists," and have done so for three hundred years. We must be allowed then to ask Dr. Moorhouse, and also his primate, Dr. Benson, to whom do you look for authority? Both these prelates have been recently scolding Catholics both for their principle of obedience to living authority, and for their imputing such authority to the Holy See. But what would they give us in exchange? If they take away the existence of living authority, they necessarily take away obedience; or, if they repudiate obedience, they repudiate living authority, to which alone obedience can be rendered. We think it hard to be anathematized by these prelates for two principles which we had supposed to be Christian.



"There is no living authority but private judgment," is an attitude we must venture to reject. Sound doctrine must be assured by living authority; and as all Catholics believe in sound doctrine and not in their private whims and caprices, they believe in living authority; without which they would be in the position of the unhappy Dr. Moorhouse and Dr. Benson.

## II.

We turn now to the "attitude" of Dr. Billsborrow, and we find ourselves at last on solid ground. In his first Lecture he takes the Protestant Bishop of Liverpool, who says that "the divisions in his own communion have grown deeper and deeper than ever, until they are now not only perilous, but hopeless," and he makes the remark that the Bishop of Manchester would be more profitably occupied in trying to lessen these divisions than in imputing "errors" to the one Church of God. He proceeds to trace the notes and characteristics of the true Church, being the opposite of those of the Established Church, and dwells historically on the connection between the Church's growth and the gradual unfolding of her definitions. And at this point we may stop to ask both Dr. Moorhouse and Dr. Benson: would their Established Church have done in the time of Nestorius, of Eutyches? How could Canterbury (in moral sense) have anathematized their heresies or defined the "Consubstantiality," the "Personality," the "Hypostatic Union?" The nation itself recoils from the absurdity of supposing that the definitions of the Established Church would have any weight with modern Anglicans; indeed, it may be said that most Anglicans are so indifferent that they care but little what the General Councils defined, or whether they themselves were anathematized. He returns to the Catholic bishop. He proceeded to dwell on the "separate powers" of the priesthood, the episcopate, and the apostolate, affirming that "though St. Peter had the primacy in common with the eleven, Our Lord reserved to himself certain prerogatives which gave him superiority over them, and made him the head of the Church, the source of its jurisdiction, the centre and bond of its unity." And on the point of jurisdiction the bishop asks Dr. Moorhouse: "When a bishop is consecrated, who gives him authority to exercise his new powers? Who assigns him his mission to his diocese? For to give a mission, to confer jurisdiction, being a purely spiritual act, is exclusively the gift of our Lord, and without it none of the powers has been committed to His Church for its government and the salvation of souls can be exercised." And, lastly, passing on to the positively ludicrous unreality of supposing that Dr. Benson

be "successor" of St. Augustine, St. Anselm or St. Thomas, the bishop shows that the new Erastianism of Elizabethanism is so exactly the opposite of the "spirituality" which was accepted by English Catholics for a thousand years, that the royal supremacy and the modern Canterbury have no more to do with Catholic government than they have to do with defining Catholic truth.

We need not linger on the treatment of the "Petrine claims"—most admirably wrought out by Dr. Billsborrow—but will confine ourselves to noting the attitude of the Catholic mind as opposed to the attitude of the Anglican mind.

We notice in the Catholic bishop's attitude (1) that he postulates the duty of obedience, not on one only but on all points of faith, which is the same thing with postulating that there is a living authority which is divinely inerrant in its teaching. But the Anglican bishop seems to imply that it is impossible for any Christian to be obedient on all points of faith, for the simple reason that he has no one to teach him what constitutes the whole Christian creed. Any Anglican may take what "view" he pleases, not of two sacraments only but of seven; his obedience being rendered only to his own apprehension of what may just possibly have been the mind of the early church. And since no two Anglicans are precisely in accord as to what this early teaching may have been—that is, on *all* points of the Christian faith—it follows that the Ecclesia Docens must be enshrined in each bosom, equally with the clergy and the laity. (2) The Catholic bishop contends that the Holy Spirit of God has at all times guided His Church into all truth; while the Anglican bishop contends that the Father of lies has been the teacher of most Catholic doctrines. Even on the most elementary and paramount question, the divine order of the government of the Church, the whole Church, says Dr. Moorhouse, went wrong from the beginning in the believing a lie about the primacy; so that to this day the only church in all Christendom which affects to have teaching authority is universally abandoned to the most certain conviction that the Pope is Christ's vicar on earth. Here we have a dilemma which is baffling. The church of Christ is supposed to teach all truth, and all Christians are supposed to believe all truth; but the Anglican bishop's creed is converted into the formula, "I believe what the Catholic Church does *not* teach, because her government is based on a falsehood." And when pressed with the question, "Since you disbelieve the Catholic Church and affirm that her authority is a fiction, *whom* do you accept for your teacher?" the answer, if honestly given, must be, "I obey myself, who am superior to all churches and pontiffs." Yet since some refuge must be found from such a profession of faith—as being impossible for any Christian who is in

earnest—that refuge is this: “I obey the early church prov may decide what it teaches.” Thus one abyss seems to c another. Now, though we may condole with a bishop of the lishment who is driven into humiliating straits, we cannot se he can assail the Catholic position as being less wise or reaso than his own. Catholics at least know whom they obey, wh obey, when they obey; they can never have a doubt about orthodoxy, nor about their peril of falling into heresy; b glicans can only be confident of their orthodoxy when the plicitly obey their own selves, and can only entertain a fear of heretics when they disesteem their interior Holy Sec. (3) Catholic bishop maintains that all the doctors and all the s as well as scores of generations of faithful Catholics—from the fourth or fifth to the sixteenth century—were probably judges of what was primitive teaching than is any Anglican b of the present day. The Anglican bishop maintains that tr lightenment as to primitive teaching was first enjoyed by the lish king, Henry VIII., after he had put away his lawful wife perhaps, also by a German monk, who, after breaking his vows, persuaded a Catholic nun to do the same, and that two hundred and fifty sects outside Anglicanism, and a good more sects inside Anglicanism, are the true heirs of the pri teaching of the Church. (The Czar’s Church is so notorious political machine, founded and kept going from political m that it need not count in any discussion of the question. Be the Czar’s Church anathematizes the Church of England for one of its innumerable heresies, save, perhaps, the heresy of royal supremacy.) (4) The Catholic bishop affirms that, in r to holy orders, there must be the legitimate conference of diction, and that without such legitimate conference some c functions of true order would be void. This jurisdiction be derived from a spiritual source; it cannot be derived fr temporal. But the Anglican bishop seems to think that spiritual jurisdiction can be conferred by a purely lay power Anglican bishops holding their right of jurisdiction by the of a sovereign or a prime minister. This at once reduces spi jurisdiction to the level of purely temporal jurisdiction, sinc impossible for the lesser to confer the greater. A soverei a prime minister, having no spiritual character, no spiritual thority or holy order—not even so much as a subdiacon follows that a lay personage cannot give what he has not, c impart what he has never received. Hence the Anglican bi have no jurisdiction; they have only lay appointment to o So that, even supposing that they possessed holy order, they have no right to exercise their functions, except in special

which it is unnecessary to go into, because the Anglican Church knows nothing of them. (5) And as to the question of holy order, the Catholic bishop lays it down that the Holy See is supreme judge of its validity. For, though the question of, say Anglican order, is a question as to matters of facts, and the Holy See is not infallible on such incidents, yet it involves a large variety of considerations which come within the doctrinal sphere. So that the practice of the Holy See, in disallowing Anglican order, is less a judgment as to the history of its origin than as to the lapse of its validity from many causes.

We have only given a few of the impressions which were forced on us by the reading of this controversy, scarcely touching upon the staple subject of the lectures, which is the historical vindication of the pontificate. That historical vindication has been often attempted in this REVIEW, and Bishop Billsborrow has but added wealth to sufficiency. Let us now, in conclusion, take a very great question, which is at this time much talked of in England, and consider it in its relations to this controversy. The question is, "the Reunion of the Churches." We shall see how the "attitude" of Bishop Billsborrow completely dispels every difficulty, and how the "attitude" of Dr. Moorhouse would render reunion equally impracticable and unreal. It does not seem to occur to Dr. Moorhouse, when he is cutting away the ground from all authority, that he is at the same time making war upon our ordinary obligations, and upon some of the higher states of Christian virtue. The root of perfection, as of obligation, being obedience to supernatural authority, Dr. Moorhouse would first destroy the root, and then argue about the nature of the fruits.

### III.

"Reunion," as it is called—though there cannot be reunion between opposites which were never united—can only be effected by the conceding of superior power to one or other of the opposites to be united. If the Church of England and the Catholic Church have exactly the same power—that is, the same supernatural authority—it is obvious that neither can dictate to the other, can presume to utter the mandate, "obey." But, if they have not the same power, one or the other must have the greater; and here it is that the Manchester controversy enables us to see our way clearly. The Protestant bishop says that both churches have the same power, because neither of them has the power to teach the other; so that "the same power" means "no power," no divine gift of inerrancy, no commission to "go, teach all nations." Then if neither has the power to teach the other, neither can have the

right to teach the other; hence, it necessarily follows that can be no obligation to inquire into, and to embrace, the truth. Almighty God having made it impossible that Christians should know what is the whole faith—and this is the inference from Dr. Moorhouse's position, though his lordship might shrink from admitting it—there cannot be any obligation to intellectually consider what can never be intellectually known. Hence heresies, schisms, and the like are hypotheses in the Anglican rule of faith; they cannot have real existence, because both heresy and schism mean resistance to divinely ordered authority. But there is no such thing as divinely ordered authority. If there were, every Christian must obey it. But since every Christian is at liberty to make choice of his own church, his own private interpretation of the Fathers, his own private interpretation of the Scriptures, a Protestant bishop in England, a Catholic bishop in Spain, and an Orthodox bishop in Moscow, being all (theoretically) on the same footing—it follows that heresies and schisms are absolute impossibilities, or that they are at best only geographical accidents. "Unity" becomes a fanciful ideal, and Dr. Moorhouse must make it Utopian. Nay, we must go so far as to say that unity would be wrong, for it would be the aspiring to a condition which is impossible in fact and not authorized by the divine dispensation. The only alternative, the only escape from these pleadings, is to affirm that true doctrine and false doctrine are equally pleasing to Almighty God, and so we may be all united in indifference. No one dares to say this, for it is impious; and therefore such notions as "obedience to the early church," "respect for primitive teaching," or "a preference for (the private estimate of) the Scriptures," are made to do duty for obedience to authority and unity in all Christian belief.

Reunion, then, in the philosophy of Dr. Moorhouse, is but a dream which the intellect rejects, though the soul may perchance sigh for its beauties. Yet here we have an obvious contradiction for the intellect and the soul cannot possibly be disunited, and pure reason and pure faith must go together. Which then of the two bishops shall we approve? In the philosophy of the Catholic bishop, reunion is very simple; for it means the submission of the human and the errant to the supernatural—the infallible God. Either reject Christianity altogether (is the conclusion to derive from this controversy), as a revelation of the whole truth to be believed, or accept the living authority which God has placed in the world, to counsel, to teach, to command. Dr. Moorhouse makes reunion impossible. Bishop Billsborrow makes it easy and blessed.

## IV.

We have seen then that this controversy about the supremacy of the Holy See, and about all that is involved in that supremacy, is really a controversy as to the very existence of authority, and therefore as to the very existence of a pure faith. It is a controversy which indeed involves almost the whole of the Christian life; for just as doctrine must depend upon authority, so must discipline, order, or regularity. Morals also are included in the question; for who shall say—to take one example—that the question of divorce is not a question of morals, involving almost the whole of domestic order? The Church of England has had to condone legal divorce, to sanction it though she could not approve it; nor has Canterbury ventured, in so much as faltering tones, to reprove the Parliament which has broken Christian law. Throughout the Christian world the only authority which has insisted on the sacramental estimate of marriage or which has insisted on the truth that whom God has joined together no man and no parliament can put asunder—is that authority which claims inerrancy in morals as well as on all points of faith. Now if the Church of England had maintained that the spiritual authority must be supreme in the determining of spiritual law, she could not have bowed the head to modern enactments which have set the spiritual law at defiance. But having asserted—as Dr. Moorhouse asserts—that there is no headship in Christian authority; that each bishop of each kingdom, or of each so-called National Church, is independent in the exercise of his judgment, save so far as he is dependent on the State, it follows that all the members of a National Church become enslaved to a secular parliament, and can enjoy no protection from their bishops. In Catholic countries, when the State passes a law which the clergy regard as unchristian, they at once appeal to the supreme spiritual authority for counsel in their difficult position. No matter what the temporal consequences may be, Cæsar must give place to God. But the unhappy position of such prelates as Dr. Moorhouse obliges them to defer to that authority which gives them their spiritual jurisdiction. Having conceded the principle that the State rules the Church; and also conceded the principle that there is no inerrant authority which has power to determine right or wrong; there is nothing left but to “shrug the shoulders,” and say, “the position is unfortunate, but we must put up with it as the price of our liberties.”

Take one more example, a question only of discipline, in the sense that it is outside of faith and morals; we allude to the celibacy of the clergy. During the last few weeks English newspapers have been busy in publishing a great number of letters with some

such heading as "Ought Clergymen to Marry?" A person called himself "A Catholic Priest," began the pleading; asserted that not a few of the Catholic clergy desired to be free from their bonds. One or two other "Catholic priests" took the other side, and declared that the great obstacle to reunion was this reasonable insistence on celibacy. Now here we have an opportunity of testing the full value of Dr. Moorhouse's private estimate of authority, not on a matter of faith or of morals, but on a matter of (admittedly severe) discipline. It is obvious that, in considering this question, we cannot separate the fitness from the authority; for it is the authority which must determine the fitness of celibacy, and which must be proved to be competent to do so. Now when we inquire what is the nature of that authority, we mean, of course, Catholic authority, which determines the question of the fitness of celibacy; and not only determines it, but proves it? If the Convocation of England was called upon to discuss the fitness, we know what that sort of "authority" would say; and we know it by the whole history of a church which has been everything in the world but supernatural. But when we ask Catholic authority to discuss the fitness, we know that we are asking an authority which has judged such questions naturally since the day of Pentecost. We are appealing to an authority which has ruled such tremendous truths, truths which would be terrible to the intellect, were they not begotten of God's love, as the Sacramental Real Presence, forgiveness in the Sacrament of Penance, purgatorial suffering and cleansing, or the efficacy of prayer for departed souls. We carry our minds back to Ephesus, or Nicea, to Trent, or to the last Council of the Vatican, and we ponder the nature, the divine character, of the truths which were pronounced to be necessary to salvation, and which receive their final authority from the Pope; and, in doing this, we are enabled to estimate the nature, the divine character, of that authority which now approves clerical celibacy. The same authority which infallibly ruled the dogmas in regard to the two natures of Christ, of God; which has anathematized, through a period of nineteen centuries, every heretic and schismatic who has disturbed the Church; has also ruled the fitness of the unmarried state for priests who stand daily at the altar, and who sit daily in the tribune of penance. Now this fitness, which is no doubt debatable in itself, because it is not included in the articles of the faith, and is not binding disciplinarily upon priests, is yet to be measured, not by the nature of the functions of every Catholic priest, but by the nature of the authority which prescribes it. And it is just for this reason that the controversy between Dr. Billsborrow and Dr. Moorhouse should be valuable to all classes of Protestants. Dr. Moorhouse is in pulling down ecclesiastical authority to a level which is



or opinionative, utterly destroys the possibility of discipline, in the sense in which Catholics understand it. Discipline must be harmonious with authority; and if you strip authority of every shred of the supernatural, you must necessarily do the same thing with discipline. We can quite understand that, in the Church of England, clerical celibacy would be incongruous; it would have no fitness with the functions of the State Church, or with doctrines which are as uncertain as the wind. But in the Catholic Church an unmarried priesthood is congruous with Holy Mass and with penance, with the certainty of the validity of holy order, with the whole of the supernatural, Catholic faith, and, as we have said, with the authority of the Holy See, and with all that is involved in its inerrancy. And it is this fitness of the discipline with the authority which shows which is the true Catholic Church. It is this fitness which, while it involves much self-sacrifice, shows the supernaturalness of the faith. The two or three "Catholic priests" (if they be so) who have written their lamentations to the newspapers, and have expressed their own preference for married life, ought to have mentioned, that like Dr. Moorhouse, they disesteemed living authority, because it interfered with their ease.

We need not go further into the argument. Our object has been to show that the position of Dr. Moorhouse is fatal to doctrine and to discipline, because it is fatal to authority. If we may judge the authority we may judge what it ordains; so that Dr. Moorhouse is consistent in judging Catholic doctrines and in selecting his own doctors and interpreters. And, in the same way, if he may judge the Church's doctrines, he may judge every detail of its discipline, since a merely human authority must be as imperfect in discipline as it must be errant in doctrines and morals. In short, all is human, all is doubtful. It is refreshing, then, to return to the Catholic bishop, and to see how he puts us on solid ground. He insists on the divinity of the Christian dispensation from beginning to end and in all time. He affirms that a divine institution requires, and possesses, living authority, and that this living authority must be as visible as it is audible, so that all the world may see it and know it. He repudiates the theory of national churches (in which each church may approve its own heresies) as being irreverent to the divine unity, disobedient to the law of Christ and fatal to the unity of Christians. He will have it that the Incarnation was the assurance of all truth; that the divine faithfulness has kept the divine promises; and that divine justice compels obedience to that authority which was planted on earth to teach the nations. Here, then, we have the true note of Catholicity. There can be no doubt about "which is the church." As in the judgment of Solomon, so we may say of the Catholic



Church, "Give her the child, for she is the mother thereof." can we understand how any Anglican who attentively studies lectures—reading both sides of the controversy—can hesitate in his judgment as to on which side is the common sense, on which side the greater reverence for truth. Certain of the details of the controversy may be disputable; for, in the going back to what is written in the earliest centuries, there is necessarily a good deal wanted besides scholarship. There must be the apprehension of the correlative history of the period, of all the indirect influences and pressures. Above all, there must be the key of intuition by which the Christian inquirer may interpret what is ambiguous, what he knows as to the certainties of the faith. And it is this "key" which the Catholic possesses. He holds in his hand the lamp of the Catholic faith, by which he investigates the places; whereas the Anglican has no lamp but private judgment, and its flickerings disturb his spiritual vision. If even in judging of what occurs to-day private judgment is proved to be unworthy, what must it be in judging of those troubled times when paganism was at war with Christianity, or imperialism was struggling for the mastery? We know that for the first two or three centuries there was necessarily reserve in Christian teaching. The catacombs were the cathedrals and the universities, and when we meet with a distinct utterance of authority we know what have been the cost of it to the persecuted. Such reflections make us wary and reverential in our "attitude" towards the very teachers. We do not ask ourselves—we ask living authority to guide us in "antiquarian" researches. Take away that living authority and we are no more competent to fix the meaning of the teachings of all the fathers on all the truths than are we competent to fix the meaning of the "many other things which Jesus did," but which are not recorded in the Gospels, or of that "effusion into all truth" which followed the Day of Pentecost, which is inherited by the holy Catholic Church.

A. F. MARSHALL

## ITALY'S SILVER JUBILEE.

"And thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of thy land: for it is the year of jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, and every one shall go back to his former family."—LEVITICUS, xxv., 10.

THE jubilee is scriptural. It is distinctively a theocratic institution. It was a year of joy, when debts were discharged, and bondage ceased, and men entered into their possessions. The custom of the jubilee has been revived in the Church in a spiritual sense. The ecclesiastical jubilee occurs regularly every twenty-five years. It is a period of remission and indulgence, when people confess their sins and give alms to the poor, and are invited to enter into their inheritance which is the grace of Christ. The name, jubilee, has been adopted in secular language to indicate certain anniversary celebrations and commemorations of events that are supposed to have brought great joy into the world. There is the golden jubilee of fifty years; and the silver jubilee, of twenty-five. The Kingdom of United Italy is nearing its twenty-fifth year, and the keeping of its silver jubilee has been at least dimly hinted at. What are the glories which United Italy will rehearse to us upon the dawn of her silver jubilee?

We are witnesses of what no other generations of men have ever witnessed. For twenty-five years we have seen two sovereigns reigning in the same city—one the rightful sovereign, the other an usurper. The usurper is sitting in the palace of the rightful sovereign and is making laws for him. The rightful sovereign has not gone beyond the bounds of what the usurper accords to him as a "residence" for five and twenty years: and yet the great ones of the earth make journeys of many days to pay court to him in his solitude. You know whom I would name: the Pope and the Prince of the house of Savoy, who is styled the King of "Italy." Who has ever seen two independent sovereigns in the same city. What is the meaning of the double representation of the European courts at Rome—one to the Pope and one to the King? It is a diplomatic absurdity such as Europe wide awake has never before been guilty of.

What is Italy? If we look at the peninsula called Italy, as we find it on the maps after the downfall of Napoleon I. and the treaty of Vienna (1815), we shall find that Italy then embraced, besides the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venice (under Austrian rule), nine independent states: Sardinia, the two Sicilies, the

Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchies of Parma, Lucca, Modena, the Republic of San Marino, the Principality of Monaco and the states of the Church. In 1847 Lucca was united to Tuscany in consequence of a marriage. In 1859-60, Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, sacrificing his saintly daughter to the Prince of Paris (Plon-Plon), and sacrificing Savoy and Nice to the ambition of Napoleon III., by the latter's aid or connivance, in the right of might, annexed Lombardy, Tuscany, Parma, Modena, the Papal States, Sicilies, and a part of the states of the Church, and even in 1870 he assumed the title of the King of Italy.<sup>1</sup> In 1866, by reason of an alliance with Prussia, when Prussia bore down upon Austria, he acquired Venetia; and in 1870 he entered Rome. The dream of a United Italy seemed to be realized. So much for the pride of nations. So much for the Congress of Vienna where Cardinal Consalvi, the Papal envoy, had been received as the representative of the most ancient dynasty of Europe; where the territorial independence of the Pontiff was accepted as essential to the peace of the continent; and where the nations pledged themselves collectively that that independence should be guarded inviolably.

When Victor Emmanuel entered Rome in 1870 he said: "This is the overthrow of the House of Savoy." About a year before his death he said, whilst gazing one day at the Vatican which he had made the captive Pius IX.: "There is a prisoner here in Rome who is not the Pope." He referred to himself. And now, after so many years from the occupation, a story is told which may explain why he called himself a prisoner in Rome. Victor Emmanuel was the natural ally of the French Emperor. He was the debtor of France and of Napoleon III. Napoleon III. had, previous to 1870, fought his battles, won his victories, and made his conquests. The sympathies of Victor Emmanuel were with Napoleon III. and the French people. Very naturally, therefore, when Prussia was planning the campaign of 1870, and the downfall of Napoleon III., the Iron Chancellor had to fear lest the Sardinian King might at any moment yield to an impulse of gratitude and cast his arms into the balance on the side of Napoleon III. With the single exception of Sig. Sella, the whole ministry of Victor Emmanuel leaned with the king toward the French alliance; Bismarck, therefore, opened negotiations with the radical section of the Italian parliament. Through the aid of Cucchi, an old Garibaldian, he drowned the fears of the radicals, and by the united efforts of Cairoli, Crispi and Nicotera, the tide of public opinion was turned

<sup>1</sup> Up to the experiment of to-day, Italy has never been one kingdom. Rome has never been the capital of Italy. Under the Roman Emperors the peninsula was inhabited by widely different peoples who formed part of a great confederation, the Roman Empire.

against the French alliance. The question was then raised of taking Rome as the capital of a United Italy. Victor Emmanuel was weak. He feared that resistance to the cry of the radicals might cost him, at their unscrupulous hands, even the crown he wore. So Napoleon fell and the Piedmontese entered Rome. The unification of Italy, in the minds of those who had thus brought it about, was regarded as a necessary preliminary step to the destruction of all hereditary rule in Italy and to the destruction of the Papal government. They saw from the beginning the impossibility of setting up the rule of red-republicanism in any of the kingdoms, duchies, principalities, that composed the geography of the peninsula. Such a foundation would have been immediately torn up by affrighted neighbors. Hence, wise in their generation, their project has been to unite the separate parts of the geographical expression, piece by piece, under the most powerful crown, previous to hurling the crown in the dust at a single blow. The taking of Rome was the last step in unification, which is the first requirement for dissolution. This did not escape Cavour, the originator of the actual unity. As early as 1861 (March 25), he declared from the tribune that the placing of the seat of government at Rome, so as to interfere with the liberty of the Pope, would be "fatal not only to Catholicism but to Italy." And Gino Capproni, whose ashes have been placed in the Pantheon beside those of Victor Emmanuel, said, before the taking of Rome: "I believe that the Pope must have a city where there will be no one above him; and I believe that that city must be Rome; and I believe that Rome would be a bad capital for Italy." After Rome had been taken, the same Capproni, blind and feeble, entered the Senate at Florence and spoke these foreboding words: "Beware! On the independence of the head of the Church depends our independence; if this independence is not secured we shall never possess Rome really and in security."

Nevertheless, Rome was taken, as has been said; and, immediately, that they might wear before the eyes of the world the garb of liberators, the Piedmontese held what they called a plebiscite, or vote of the people, for or against the Papal rule. The day was announced. The polls were taken possession of; and, by a system of terrorism which prevented honest men from approaching the polls, the invaders were able to telegraph over the world that night that 46 votes had been cast for Papal rule, and 40,000 votes against it. There is a marble slab inserted into the front of the Capitol, on which is inscribed the legend, that in the plebiscite after the taking of Rome, the city was chosen as the capital of Italy by a vote of 298,000 against 48 votes. Whatever the numbers may have been, one thing is certain, the vote was cast by the

scum of Italy, which had come into Rome in the wake of the invading troops. The plebiscite was not a vote of the Roman people, but a Piedmontese governmental falsehood. This is proved by the immediately preceding demonstrations of the people in favor of Pius IX., when the invaders were at the gates. The desire of the people to fall upon the invaders proves it; a desire which Pius IX. saw would end in needless bloodshed, and was therefore discountenanced. The fact that not a sign of exultation was shown on the Corso over the triumph proves it. The shop-doors were all closed as in mourning, and the drapery that always marks a Roman festal day was not seen upon one balcony on the Corso named for the celebration. The fact that the palaces and churches hung out foreign flags as for protection against an enemy proves it. The protest of the Roman voters, signed with their names and residence, proves it. There was not one journal for the invaders established by a Roman. An effort was made to keep the public by keeping the former officials; but they would not hold office under the Piedmontese. The Piedmontese could not find so much as a satisfactory city council of native Romans. But, without going farther, the plebiscite itself is proof enough. It was the vote of a mob of ruffians, of criminals and of alien soldiers.

But the invaders were ill at ease. In the face of the demands they had to make some profession. So they passed the law of guarantees, by which they professed to secure to the Pope the right of absolute independence, and free control of Catholic institutions in Rome and in the six suburban vicariates. The law was put into execution by stripping the Pontiff of his possessions. On November 7, 1870, less than two months after the invasion, General la Marmora sent word to Pius IX. that the Quirinal Palace, the Papal residence, would have to become the property of the Italian state. Pius refused to cede it. A blacksmith was called in; the doors were forced; and on November 10th the "*Gazzetta Ufficiale del Regno d'Italia*" announced: "Yesterday at noon, the king took possession of the Quirinal." The Pope was allowed the Vatican "residence." The guarantees were a lie from the beginning. The "residence" has been turned into a prison. The Sardinian and Piedmontese—to use the names indifferently—have had control of the telegraphs, the railroads, the mails, and of all means of communication between the Pope and the Church. Besides, the usurper arrogates to himself the power of a "veto" over the appointment of bishops and pastors. Two years ago, there were as many as forty bishops excluded from their sees and prohibited entrance into the houses built for them by the faithful of the Church. To understand how free the living Pope is to appeal to the public, we have but to call to mind the outrages of the mob

attacked the dead body of Pius IX. on the night of September 20, 1881, when it was being carried to the tomb in the cemetery of St. Lawrence.

Italy is posing before the world to-day as a great nation, with a huge army and an exceptionally formidable navy. In 1882, the fleet numbered 117 vessels, with 9400 sailors; in 1892, it had grown to 329 vessels, with 21,000 sailors. In 1882, the total available army force was 1,986,000 men; in 1892, 3,027,000 men. She has also her million of civil officials, with all the apparatus that so many officials imply. All this demands a large revenue. Money is required to carry on a kingdom—and such a kingdom. What are the capabilities of the sources from which a revenue necessarily so enormous must be drawn? As early as 1861, when Victor Emmanuel first took the title of King of Italy, after the seizure of the whole of the peninsula, with the exception of some of the estates of the Church, the government expenditure was \$151,000,000, and the deficit that year was \$60,000,000.<sup>1</sup> But, from the beginning, the Church was called upon to pay the debts of the usurping government. The spoliation of Church property for the single year 1867 was reckoned at \$116,000,000. In 1870, after the taking of Rome, when the era of Italian splendor began, this method of raising a revenue was applied with fitting magnificence to the whole peninsula. Hundreds upon hundreds of churches and monasteries, whose inmates were driven out, were seized, and either torn down, sold at auction, or turned into barracks or brothels. For twenty-five years the work has gone on. Church lands have been confiscated, and even the vestments and chalices of the altar have been put up for sale. In this way the Italian parliament, pushed for means to vote its ever-swelling budget, has spoiled the Church, and driven out penniless upon the streets, not merely religious men, but thousands of peaceful nuns. And, simultaneously with the inauguration of this barbarity, practiced upon those whose lives were devoted to prayer and deeds of mercy, the invaders introduced into the city of Rome the reign of blasphemy and public obscenity.

From the taking of Rome, notwithstanding the colossal spoliations, the deficit in the public treasury went on increasing until, in 1872, the public debt had passed the sum of 1700 million dollars. Since 1872, in spite of an incredible outlay continually augmented, there have been years when the revenue has been made to come near to the expenditure; and thus the debt has not in-

---

<sup>1</sup> Our computations throughout are made on the basis of 5 *lire* to the dollar. 5 *lire* are really equivalent to only 95 cents; but we have neglected the fractions of millions, and this gives us a very fair approximation in round numbers.

creased each year in the same proportion. How is it that the expenditure has been multiplied fabulously year by year? The debt has not always increased in the same proportions? No new source of revenue has sprung up since the taking of Rome. No new source. Not one new source of true revenue has been found or developed since the taking of Rome. The yearly deficit has simply been cancelled in a more gorgeous style by the sale of private property. The government just condemned your property, sold it at auction, pocketed the money and gave you bonds which will soon be worthless. This was the way in which the government made a loan to the government. We remember how, about a dozen years ago, the famous missionary College of the Propagation of the Faith was forced to sell its real estate and accept for the proceeds government bonds of half value. This same method of securing a revenue was shortly after about to be applied to the American College at Rome, the property of citizens of the United States. President Arthur, of happy memory, regarded the theft as a little too royal for endurance. He sent word to plundering Italy to keep its hands off. It is not necessary to add that his orders were obeyed. In this and other kindred ways the treasury has been supplied, and the government has been able to credit itself with an actual peace army of 800,000, and a war footing of over 3,000,000 soldiers; and this, too, in a population of 30,000,000 on a territory about three times as large as Ohio, and at an expense for military equipment and maintenance of from \$85,000,000 to \$100,000,000 a year, or from \$250,000 to \$300,000 a day.

Now, the annual interest to be paid upon the public debt has been stated to be \$153,000,000. Sometimes it is not easy to get stolen real estate, so expedients have to be devised to secure ready money, and taxation is a ready expedient. The sum must be made to equal the demand. Hence it is that taxes may eat up half an income even when profits are fair. House rents have been as high as 49 per centum of the assessed rent. A son is taxed on becoming heir to his father's possessions. It requires a large income to be able to pay all the various taxes and still live. If the income decreases, the taxes have often to be paid by retrenching on the necessities of life, and from this grinding taxation there has resulted the greatest distress, especially in the rural districts.

In 1890 there were, according to the official reports, 4774 communes where meat was used only by families in good circumstances, and such families were few. Throughout 3638 communes, beef never went to the table. Even in fertile Lombardy and Aemilia thousands have been carried off by a drought that is due, in great part, to scanty and unwholesome food.



in the northern provinces the burdensome taxes upon real estate have been generally paid, even at these sacrifices. And why have the taxes been generally paid thus far, at such sacrifices, in the northern provinces? The story of the less rich southern provinces will answer. It is a question of payment or confiscation. In the one province of Naples, even previous to 1883, 40,000 small holdings had been confiscated because the owners could not pay the taxes. In 1887, according to M. Gallenga (no friend to the papal sovereignty), the 40,000 had grown to 65,000. Of these 65,000 estates which were either seized by the officials or even abandoned before the inevitable seizure—out of these 65,000 there were 25,000 estates that could not find a purchaser at governmental auction. Senator Jacini, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, said, as early as 1880, that if they wanted to get more money out of the farmer, they would have to tax him on fresh air.

The ruin of the land-owners has entailed, of course, the idleness and dispersion of the land laborers. These are the men who are coming to America to render still more complicated our labor and emigration problem.

But the same difficulty besets the shopkeeper. The shopkeeper has had to pay an income tax of more than 30 per centum on all incomes exceeding \$100. To understand the situation, take the illustration of a man with a small business and a small home. The income from his business is, we shall say, \$1200. Suppose that out of this he pays the government  $30\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. as an income tax, or an income tax of \$365. This would leave him \$835. Suppose that his little home would rent for \$240 a year, and that he has to pay 38 per cent. of this assessed rent, or \$90 a year, to the government. This would leave him \$745, after the two taxes, out of his income of \$1200. Out of this \$745, or \$14.50 a week, he has to pay gas bills, doctor's bills, to buy food and clothing and fuel for himself, his wife and two or three children, and to keep his house in repair. How much can this shopkeeper lay by? Nothing. If business is slack for a year or two, what has he to fall back on? Nothing. If the profits of his business fall from \$1200 to \$700, the government still seizes over \$300 for income and house tax alone, and he has only the remainder, between \$7 and \$8 a week, for all the expenses of himself, his wife and children. So when he finds himself exposed to or even reduced to the extremity of having to pay his taxes out of his little capital, he, too, gathers together his family and emigrates to America. Even when all the members of a family live together, all working and combining their wages, the taxes alone take about one-fourth of their earnings. The year's living, in strictest economy, takes



all the rest, and sometimes more. The taxes in Florence are to be six times what they were twenty years ago. The taxes have been increased universally to the utmost limit, and, as we have seen lately, they do not suffice to pay the interest on the public debt. In 1881 the local taxation was \$121,000,000, and in 1892 it was more than \$150,000,000.

Some idea of the tariff methods may be formed from the taxes levied upon a few articles of general use. The tax on sugar is equal to the value of the sugar. The tax on coffee is twice the value of the coffee. The tax on coal-oil is three times the value of the oil. The tax on spirits is five times the value of the spirits. So that for a pound of sugar the people pay the worth of six pounds; for a pound of coffee, the worth of three pounds; for a gallon of oil, the worth of four gallons, and for a gallon of spirits the worth of six gallons. Salt is made in Italy, but the people have to pay for it forty times the cost of production, thus paying three or four times the price that is paid even in countries where no salt is produced. A story is told of a father of a family in Naples who was summoned before the court, and charged with having taken five pails of water out of the bay. He pleaded that he wanted the water as a bath for his sick children. He was dismissed with a reprimand and a fine to the value of the salt contained in the five buckets of water from the Mediterranean. Salt is a government monopoly. The price of salt was for a long time thirty-five times the cost of production; now it is forty times. This means that the consumer pays four dollars for a bag of salt which has been made at an outlay of ten cents. The Italian government, keen in its economic perceptions, learned early that salt is necessary to the human system, and concluded that he who might put its own price upon the commodity. But as the price increased, the consumption decreased, because the people, growing poorer and poorer, were unable to pay the exorbitant price. In 1882 the amount of salt consumed was 22 pounds per head; in 1892 it was 14 pounds per head. The raising of the price to forty times the cost of production was intended to remedy the matter—on the government side. A man living on the sea coast is allowed to draw one pail of water a day from the deep. But it is the government monopoly guarded that the poor man, with the ocean rolling at his feet, may not escape paying high tariff on a pinch of salt.

In 1869—that is, just before the occupation of Rome and the establishment of "Italy"—there were, it is said, about 7,000,000 Italians, all told, in the United States. At present we think there is nothing to receive that many in a year. In 1869 the total emigration from Italy was 23,000. In 1876 it rose only to 27,000.

In 1879 it leaped up to 119,821. In 1887 153,000 Italians emigrated to America alone. In 1888 the number of emigrants that left from the single port of Genoa alone was 181,000, and the total emigration in the same year was 290,736, a figure which put Italy, in this respect, ahead of all the continental nations.

The condition of wretchedness to which the people have been reduced has sometimes been spoken of openly in parliament.

Deputy Romano (speech of December 12, 1885) described the state of Italy as being even then one of "general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, the fruit of public wrong." He said there was "a general struggle for existence by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government." They were suffering, he said, "all the consequences of ill-advising hunger, deterioration of character, immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime, smuggling, usury, crimes and suicides, and an unnecessary discontent that is undermining our constitutions and the tranquillity of the state." (Translation of Rt. Rev. John O'Connor, D.D., in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1886.)

The Italian public debt was:

In 1861, \$600,000,000.

In 1872, \$1,700,000,000.

In 1876, \$1,800,000,000.

In 1890, \$2,500,000,000.

This is exclusive of a communal debt of \$250,000,000. Thus has the debt grown in time of peace and in those early days when a nation is supposed to be practicing the economy so necessary to ensure its existence. The tax necessary to pay the interest on the debt, over and above the tax required to meet the fabulous running expenses, is \$4.50 per head of the total population of 30,000,000 people, whilst in England it is \$3.75; in Austria, \$3.00; in Prussia, \$2.50, and in Russia, \$1.50. The amount of revenue spent since 1872 is something like \$5,300,000,000, and the expenditure of the past ten years shows an increase of 30 per cent., as compared with that of the ten years preceding. But the revenue has been steadily decreasing. The sources of plunder have been exhausted one by one, and the natural sources of revenue, when dried at the fountain, cannot be expected to be perennial or to replenish themselves. The revenue was:

In 1889-90, \$380,000,000.

In 1890-91, \$379,000,000.

In 1891-92, \$355,000,000.

In 1892-93, \$333,000,000.

The deficit for many years back gives an average of \$8,000,000 per annum. In October, 1893, Signor Giolitti, who was then Minister of Finance, stated that he needed only \$2,800,000 to cover the deficit of that year. But in February, 1894, Signor Sonnino confessed to the Chamber that he had a deficit of \$7,000,000, and that there existed a floating debt of \$100,000,000 made up solely from the accumulation of the yearly deficits. Signor Sonnino was bold in presenting a remedy for the deficit of the year. His proposition was that those who held 5 per cent. bonds should be asked to freely accept 4 per cent., and that if they refused to accept this freely, they were to have an income tax of 5 per cent., or one-fifth, levied on their interest. Thus they would have a choice between a free and a constrained donation of six per cent. of the seven millions which he needed for the moment. This was a merry financiering. An open parliamentary proposition to repudiate the interest on the public debt is only the "tuning up" for a great orchestral movement that is coming. Added to this is the coinage of Italy, as compared with our own, may help to give some understanding. In the year 1892 the total Italian coinage of both gold and silver was \$153,002, whilst the coinage of gold alone in the United States was more than \$34,250,000. And yet somehow, we are complaining of a scarcity of money.

The strain on the banks began to be felt as very pressing six years ago, and it does not require much foresight to see that the late gigantic bank failures are only a shadow of what is to come. Perhaps the terrible straits to which the government has been reduced may be imagined from the statement which was made in the rounds of the press in January, 1894. Twenty million lire, or, something less than four million dollars, were needed to pay an urgent debt. The government applied to the Italian bankers, but these either could not or would not advance the money to the national treasury. Not knowing what to do, Signor Sonnino appealed to the German government, and obtained the money only after threatening to break away from the Triple Alliance. The money was not forthcoming. This money was to pay the interest on the debt, to meet the accruing coupons. It could not be had in Italy. It could be obtained in Germany only, and only under threat, for Germany may soon need that Italian money which is costing the Italian people three hundred thousand lire a day. This borrowing to pay the interest is the first scene in the last act. How long will Germany hand over the money? Or soon may a war be precipitated to cast all the fortunes of Italy into the pot?

Italy pays yearly to foreigners not less than \$50,000,000 in

as interest. The balance of trade is against Italy by from \$50,000,000 to \$85,000,000 a year. This, however, is counteracted by the money which tourists spend in the country; Americans leaving in Italy about \$35,000,000, and the English, French and Germans together, about \$70,000,000 yearly.

In addition to the bankruptcy just spoken of, a crevice was opened at the same time in the vaults of the national treasury, through which keen brokers were drawing from the government a ten per cent. premium on the total issue of silver, without making any loan whatsoever to the State. And this ten per cent. they were able to draw as often as once or twice a week. This may seem strange, but to understand the case, remember that Italian money is in gold, silver, paper and copper. This, of course, is nothing extraordinary. But Italy, being in the Latin Monetary Union, is bound by the articles of the Union to coin only a limited amount of silver; and thus the silver of each State passes, on the bi-metallic standard, for gold, in each State of the Union. Now, on account of the condition of Italian finances, the government paper (the smallest note being five lire, or ninety-five cents), is at a discount of ten per cent. as compared with gold; whilst, on account of the less inherent value of the silver token money, the paper remains at par as compared with silver. Suppose, then, that you have a hundred dollars in paper; you can exchange it for a hundred dollars in silver. This silver you can send to France, or to some other State in the Latin Monetary Union, and there you exchange it for a hundred dollars in gold. The gold you bring back to Italy and exchange it for Italian paper, receiving readily 110 in paper for your 100 in gold. Thus your paper 100 of yesterday or of last week has become 110. Repeat the operation ten times, and, without compounding, you have doubled your capital. This is really what took place. All the silver was swept away; and where it was replaced, the substitute was gold at a premium of ten per cent., or paper at a discount of ten per cent. The effect of this upon the entire retail trade was disastrous. In the summer of 1893, and up to the middle of the autumn there was left for change only paper and copper. But the smallest note in paper was for five lire, or ninety-five cents. Besides this, there was nothing but the copper cent and the fifth of a cent. But as it was never contemplated to make the copper token-coin the largest and the only change under a dollar, the copper coinage has, of course, been very limited, and cannot be increased on account of the comparative worthlessness of copper. It is not hard to understand the paralysis with which entire retail trade was stricken. Change had to be made to a purchaser with heavy rolls of copper, with postage stamps, and even with small articles of everyday use,

such as matches. When even this could not be done, there remained a choice between no sale or credit. The railways are government monopolies, made no change to ticket but at the stations; and if a traveller had not the pennies to pay for baggage, he had either to leave it behind him, or to give it up on his journey. During the month of October (1893), the government began the issue of paper notes of the value of one lire (1900) which it declared legal tender, to meet the requirements of the people for small change; and set about gathering in the silver to help pay its foreign indebtedness. It may be remembered that the debt of the Italian government is held chiefly by foreigners. Four-fifths of the interest is paid to foreigners, mainly the French. War, therefore, with France, in the hope of repurchase, would not be an unwelcome thing to the responsible parties. They would, of course, be safe from the bullets. But there are bullets too many and too wide to be plastered over with paper; and they may well pity the poor people whose fortune will lie in the pounds of paper issued by a government already in a state of bankruptcy. Still, for the present needs they are constrained to put up with the deceit.

The business failures in 1879 were 700; in 1883 they were 1,000; in 1888-89 they were 4400. Insolvent establishments have been closing up faster than the courts can attend to them. 5,000,000 proprietors of the soil, 4,000,000 are small proprietors, and these, oppressed by the heaviest taxation in all Europe, are mortgaging their lands away. The mortgages of real property were:

In 1876, \$1,318,000,000.

In 1886, \$1,551,000,000.

In 1890, \$1,644,000,000.

That is to say, from 1876 to 1890 the mortgages increased by \$300,000,000, notwithstanding that in the same time, as was to be seen, so many emigrated, and so many others simply deserted their lands. In the meantime, whilst the backbone of the nation was being thus broken, the war budget grew from \$43,000,000 in 1876 to \$113,000,000 in 1889. With the land out of cultivation, production has, of course, diminished; exports have fallen; bank deposits have diminished; and the imports, too, have fallen away—the money is not there to pay for them.

Once, when King Humbert complained to Sindaco Merello of the flood of emigrants pouring out of the country, Merello replied that it was simply a case of *emigration* or *starvation*. When the king asked him why he did not try to supply the needs of agriculture by the promotion of manufactures, Merello answered: "We have no capital." And when the king urged further

2,000,000 lire (\$400,000) would be sufficient to start some kind of manufactures, the city treasurer (it was at Ravenna, before the present crisis), broke in, "Perhaps Your Majesty would find us 2,000,000 lire." At this, it is said, the king looked serious. And then Crispi, when called upon to give his attention to the matter, goes off and writes letters, stating that he has been studying the situation, and that the solution of the problem will be the glory of Humbert's reign!!! We have before us, now, the solution and the glory.

About the vandalism of the Italian government, I shall say but a word. It would form the subject of a long and annoying discourse. Suffice it to state that the government has renewed the work of the barbarians, defacing or tearing down the ancient ruins and architectural wonders that formed the study of the visiting world and linked our age steam with the patience and magnificence of the past. "Ouida," writing in the "North American Review" (Oct., 1888), says: "All over the land destruction of the vilest and most vulgar kind is at work: destruction before which the more excusable and more virile destruction of war looks almost noble. For, the present destruction has no other motive, object, or mainspring, than the lowest greed." To such an extent was this carried on that, as we remember, a few years ago the German archæologists made an appeal to the world, and the artists and scholars of Europe called upon the Sardinian Government to give over its vandalism. Everybody knows Da Vinci's masterpiece, *The Last Supper*. Da Vinci lived in an age of great painters. He excelled all the painters of his day. "*The Last Supper*," is his greatest work, and we may say, the greatest work that has ever been produced. He painted it upon the wall of the refectory in the Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie, at Milan. This painting is styled, simply, the highest effort of Christian art. The Italian government turned that refectory into a stable and left the marvellous work of art to the horses. A move was even made to destroy the wondrous relic, the mausoleum of Hadrian, the castle of San Angelo, for the purpose of widening a street.

The one person who has made himself signally notorious during the short life of the Kingdom of Italy, is Signor Crispi, who held the office of prime minister for about four years, and who was forced to retire in January, 1891. In 1864 Crispi was a member of the Piedmontese parliament, the parliament of Victor Emmanuel, at Florence. In one of his parliamentary speeches of that year we read the following words: "The Roman Pontiff cannot become a citizen of a great state. He must be a prince second to no one." In six years Crispi had become the open enemy of Pope and King, for, in 1870 we find him one of that notorious committee which

put to the Piedmontese Ministry this ultimatum: "Order troops to march upon Rome, or we shall proclaim the republic and the downfall of the monarchy." Crispi had become the champion of the advanced revolutionists; and, by a strange paradox of history, as we have seen, these Italian Jacobins were the tools of marckian despotism. Prussia allowed them to satisfy their hatred of religion by thus forcing Victor Emmanuel on to Rome under threat of his crown, in order that through them Victor Emmanuel might be kept from an alliance with Napoleon III. with whom Prussia was just then at war.

Crispi, as an agent of the revolution, has been more daring than his predecessors, the prime ministers, Cavour, D'Azeglio and Depretis. He has been no lover of the illegitimate government which he has made a show of serving. And though he has been attacking the Pope, it is not that he has hated the monarchy, but, that with the heart of the renegade, he hates the Church. He knew from the beginning that the greatest obstacle to the destruction of the civil order was the existence of the Church. He quote from the *Riforma*, his organ: "In Italy, among the masons we count the illustrious head of the government. His late conduct has been rigorously in keeping with masonic principles." What these principles are in Italy we learn from a circular issued by the Grand Orient of Italy towards the end of 1886. The circular declares that "the suppression of religious orders, the confiscation of ecclesiastical goods and the destruction of the temporal power, form the granite base upon which Masonry must rest." D'Azeglio had said long ago, at Turin, that for them, the Roman Question was a question of hate. The leaders of the Italian Parliament with Crispi at their head were enemies of the monarchy, but the Church stood in the way of their socialistic schemes. The mere fact of Crispi being imposed upon Humbert, as his prime minister, by the party of the revolution, was, in itself, without exposition, to those who knew the circumstances, clear evidence of the short lease of life that remained to the kingdom of Italy.

On the one hand, with the military of Italy under the command of Bismarck, Crispi, who was a cringing creature of Bismarck, knew that it was impossible to carry out his radical ideas in the present order. The revolution, nevertheless, emboldened by the advancement of Crispi, began to display itself. Hostile socialistic demonstrations were made from one end of the peninsula to the other. Even the students of the dechristianized university set on foot a riot, when the king and queen went to open the exposition at Bologna. On the other hand, Crispi heard millions raising their voices in the shattered state of society for a restoration of



Papal States. To counteract the influence of these he had passed the code of penal laws which are fresh in our memories and which went into effect the first day of January, 1890, laws so brutal and draconian that we marvel at their being proposed in the nineteenth century in the midst of a civilized people. The long continued and ever growing protests of eighteen years against the desecrations and spoliations of the usurping government; moreover, the magnificent proclamation of Leo's sovereignty made by the world irrespective of creed at the time of the Papal jubilee, all this had driven the terror-stricken revolutionary parliament to the passage of a penal code such as England never applied to Ireland in Ireland's darkest days. It came from that party that blazons liberty and equality on its banners, but which has never been known to allow even liberty of speech to any adversary whom it could crush by main force. According to this new code, any minister of religion who will dare to criticise the rascality of the highway robbery that is going on and has been going on under the name of law, can be fined six hundred dollars and be sent to prison for three years. This is by clause 104 which reads: "Any minister of religion who, abusing the moral power he possesses by reason of his office, bringing into contempt the laws and institutions of his country or the acts of the authorities, is punishable with imprisonment from six months to three years and a fine of from five hundred to three thousand lire." This is gag law. The mere mention of these institutions and laws is necessarily to hold them up to contempt. Again, for any bishop or priest who advocates, even in private conversation, the restoration of any part of the Papal States, clause 101 decrees penal servitude for life—a punishment that is rarely visited upon the most desperate assassins taken with their hands red in the blood of their victims. Cardinal Manning, speaking of clause 104, said: "Had this law been in operation here, I should have incurred I know not what penalty of imprisonment and I know not what fine." The London *Saturday Review* says, "There can be no question that these new laws are tyrannical in principle." The anti-papal London *Times* remarks, "The Church, from the Pope down to the lowest ecclesiastic, is in the hands of the State without defence from the action of the law." (From its own Roman correspondent). The London *Spectator* says, "These laws are as bad as any of our own penal laws." The code passed, though some of the senators hostile to the Papacy argued that it boded no good to the government to be showing so much mildness to criminals, and so much severity to those who habitually preached order and morality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Discourse at St. Mary's, Moorfields, July 7, 1888.



It may be asked; why do not the people resist? Are the people depraved, as a whole? No. The greater part of them are practical catholics—seventy per centum in a population of thirty million. Why do they not resist at the polls as the people did in Belgium? In examining these questions, we find five obstacles to a favorable reply, obstacles which are sufficient and without going into the difficulties in the way of an unarmed drilled majority endeavoring to shake off a military despotism.

1. The Pope has forbidden participation in the general elections, because this would be a recognition of the illegitimacy of the government.

2. The overthrow of the military despotism by a civil election would be provided against by the government, which would be moving its whole army of officials, civil and military, to prevent itself by fraud, force and intimidation. It would keep its power by the same means by which it came into power.

3. A conscientious man, if elected to parliament, could not take the oath of office. Thus it would be impossible for conscientious men, coming in one by one, to obtain a majority.

4. Even if, by some improbable means, conscientious men should obtain a majority in the Chamber, or House of Representatives, there still remains the Senate which with the royal prerogative of senatorial appointment can be colored at will.

5. And even beyond this there is the unlimited veto power of the King.

In municipal or city elections conscientious men are sometimes returned; but their power does not extend beyond the municipality. Indeed, out of thirty million people, there are not more than eight million adherents of the government. The title, "Kingdom of Italy," is to-day as it has been from the beginning another name for a military occupation. You may ask how a state of things can be allowed to exist, and why the people do not rise up and put an end to it. We will ask you in return, is that four or five boys can board a railway train and plunder it even whilst that train is under the protection of the United States government which has the support of sixty-five million people? Or how can it come to pass that a great metropolis may at times be ruled by a body of men whom the really representative men of the community will not so much as recognize in their own life?

But how was it that for twenty-three years we were not told the whole truth about the condition of Italy, in that foreign newspaper column which marks the wonderful energy of our daily American press? The reason is simply this, that the whole truth was not transmitted. And why was it not transmitted? Because

conduits through which the Italian news had to filter before reaching the cable were and have been as they are occupied by parties hostile to the Papacy. And so the world has been hoodwinked with cable-dispatches about the large army and big ships, and the appointment of Cardinals, and the health of the Pope. Letters arriving from time to time and giving the true situation were rarely printed in the daily press and hence did not reach the people at large. Hence our journalism, phenomenal for its enterprise, has been at least negatively instrumental in rendering still more phenomenal the misinformation of the American people concerning Italy and the Pope. But within the last two years there occurred two events which fixed the attention of the world—though it were only for the moment—upon the cruelty, self-seeking and depravity of the powers that rule in Italy. We refer to the bank scandal and to the Sicilian revolt. Any one accustomed to keep his eye upon the “cable” could see that both events were dismissed with the greatest possible dispatch. Yet they were so public and they so affected public official action that they could not be veiled from the world by a web of stories woven out of consistories and the possibilities of Leo’s successor. On the 1st day of December, 1893, the Italian Parliament was the scene of indescribable confusion. There was hissing and cursing and a call for the fire brand. Sometime previously the depositors of the Bank of Rome had discovered that the bank had been despoiled. An investigation had been demanded and the government had resisted the investigation, parliamentary investigation, though there was unequivocal accusation of actual and past Cabinet Ministers being implicated in the embezzlements of Rome, Palermo and Naples. The clamor had to be quieted by allowing the investigation to be made and the sealed report of Committee was handed to the President of the Chamber on the 1st of December, 1893. The report implicated the Prime Minister, some members of the Cabinet and most of the leading men in Parliament. Even the royal family did not escape unsinged. The money, it seems, was used to buy votes. That was all. We can imagine how the Chamber went wild with excitement when it heard the Commission report complicity on the part of ministers and ex-ministers of state.

It is not necessary for us to rehearse here the story of Sicily. The late rioting and bloodshed consequent upon the misery of the people are fresh in our memories. But it is well for us to remember how at the time the Italian journals acknowledged that there were many other provinces of Italy where the people were just as miserable, and declared that Sicily and Naples had been liberated from one tyrant (Bourbon) only to be put at the mercy

of a hundred thousand. The brutal government had to content not with men alone. It was said at the time that as many as 80 Sicilian women were imprisoned in a week. A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* (April, 1894), speaking of Sicily, says: "Military tribunals judge civil offences, or what are considered offences, and pass sentence of imprisonment, varying in duration from six months to thirty years. The infamous sentence of twenty-three years' imprisonment, of which three are to be passed in solitary confinement, passed on the young advocate Molinari, for what is really no more than offence of opinions, has forced a cry of surprise and disgust even from the German press. Hundreds of brutal sentences have been passed for which there is no hope of chance of appeal, and vast numbers of men in the flower of youth or in the prime of manhood are being flung into the hell of Italian prisons, there to be left to rot away in unseen and unpitied suffering till death releases them or insanity seizes them."

The example of official public robbery given by the government has, of course, been followed by those who choose to ply the trade upon a smaller scale. Hence, both Sicily and the Peninsula are infested with brigands. Brigands hover about the very gates of Rome. The story of the brigands is a long one, and we cannot find place for it here. It may be dismissed, therefore, with the following statement, made last autumn by the correspondent of the Liverpool *Catholic Times*: "The public sustain and protect brigands in the neighborhood of Viterbo and all over Sicily. Many proprietors pay a regular sum to certain powerful chiefs who, in return, protect their property and person, and, moreover, prevent any other brigands from attacking them. We can assert as a positive fact that some powerful princes of the Roman aristocracy pay as much as 4000 and 5000 lire a year in order to secure this protection of their lives and property; and during the few months they pass in their country possessions, their children, and, indeed, all members of the family, are constantly kept in view, even during a short walk, by a protector chosen, no doubt, from the band of brigands."

As many as eight years ago, Prime Minister Depretis, reviewing the condition of the country, sounded the alarm to the government. Depretis went out and Crispi came in. Crispi only intensified the situation. The *Tribuna* newspaper of Rome, began to speak openly of bankruptcy and general anarchy. It stated (February 7 and 8, 1889) that the workmen were using language such as this: "We will not have alms. If we cannot get work, we shall turn our thoughts to petroleum or dynamite." And the *Nazione* announced (January 28, 1889) that famine had become the "vital question for Italy," and that no other question was so

urgent. The *Tribuna*, too, began to speak of famine as the "supreme question, the truly urgent question, upon whose solution depends the solution of all the others." At the opening of the year 1889 the same *Tribuna* (government newspaper) put the case thus tersely: "Now we are in chaos, or rather we are about to enter it." Twelve months went by, and on the last day of January, 1891, Crispi, after a blustering speech in the chamber, and challenging a vote upon his new tax bill as the test of his popularity, was defeated by a vote of 186 to 123. His resignation of the premiership soon followed the defeat. The king found it difficult to secure an incumbent for the vacant office. The Marchese di Rudini at length accepted, but he resigned as soon as he found out what he had done. Then came Signor Giolitti, but he too retired before the coming hurricane. So Crispi had to step into power again to celebrate the silver jubilee. Let us call to mind what he said after the affair of Ravenna, that the solution of the problem would be the glory of Humbert's reign. It is time to read over again that letter of Mazzini, which lies in the Brera Library of Milan, and in which the old conspirator, Balaam-like, announces that "Crispi will be the last minister of the monarchy."

The people are growing tired, very tired of it all. Some years ago when Sardinia—of which Humbert is really king—was a prey to famine and the people were making bread out of acorns, the Sardinian representatives in the parliament threatened to resign rather than be party to a government that was treating its subjects to death by starvation. At the same time the President of the Council at Genoa said on taking his seat: "The monarchy has had its chance. . . . The sooner it disappears the better. If it will not do so in a courtly way, it will be taught another method." This voice is echoed all over the land, and the new mayors of the cities have been refusing to take the oath of office. The voters, too, few as they are, are becoming very indifferent. At the Roman election when Signor Bonghi was defeated in the beginning of last year, out of 6890 electors, 5032 stayed away from the polls. Germany is disgusted. Last September the *Reichsbote*, which was looked upon as the organ of Chancellor Caprivi, used some very strong language, looking at things from the point of view of one who might soon have need of that great Italian army. It spoke in tones of rebuke about the robbery of the arsenals that has been going on for years, loads of rifles being carted across the border or scattered through Italy as sporting guns. It said that such a thing could never happen to the Royal Arsenals if the administration were not in for some of the plunder; and it hinted significantly that no one could place any reliance upon an ally that had no faith in itself.

As we are telling a tale of robberies it will not do to omit a huge theft committed five years ago and which was so dastardly as to call forth a storm of indignation from the Turkish press. It was nothing less than the confiscation of a sum of money estimated at \$400,000,000, "accumulated," to use the words of the *York Times'* correspondent, "in the course of centuries by every city of the peninsula, by generous and charitable donors and testators." There was a revenue of about thirty millions a year from these charitable bequests; so the government took the management into its own hands regardless of the will of the donors. It was clear at the time that there was little left to steal by the donors. The debate upon the subject in the House of Deputies was carried on in an illegal manner. Most of the time there was not a quorum in the house—only from 80 to 100 members being present at a roll call of 508. Finally 295 members were gathered in; a secret ballot was taken with black and white balls so that no one should know how another had voted. The result of this corruption was to stop all charitable bequests during the death-struggle of the present kingdom of Italy. If, this morning, we had seen in the dispatches from Washington that the national legislature had confiscated all the charitable bequests left, during our one century of existence, to hospitals, asylums, infirmaries, refuges, homes for the friendless, as a perpetual dowry to the widow, the orphan, the waif, the foundling, the homeless sick and the unnumbered poor, what would we have thought of it? But we need say enough. Volumes would not contain the history of Italian sacrilegious thefts. Pretexts were never wanting. When the *forma* was agitating the suppression of the convents and academies where young ladies were receiving a Christian education, it was forwarded as a plea that religion could not be eradicated so long as the women sided with the Pope.

To summarize, therefore, Italy is ready to celebrate her silver jubilee. But where is the silver? In twenty-five years Italy has wished to rival England and France and Germany and Russia, nations whose present strength is the accumulated vigor of centuries. It is held together by bands of iron and not by the homogeneity of its own mass. Its government is neither by the people nor for the people. It has put on those appurtenances of a great power, which in all great powers have always grown naturally, like an outer integument, around the heart and core of the nation, from the substantial development of the seed. It has put on the raiment of a great nation, but cannot pay its debts and is nishings. The pride of being clad in the raiment of a great nation has made Italy thief so steadily and so enormously at the root of supplies, that the root itself is withered and the fruit cut off.

long ago. So Italy must fight with somebody to pay for her soldier clothes or else cut herself down to the figure of Greece and Portugal. There is no hope for a revival on the present status. The possibility of a tax expedient is past. The tax limit has been reached. Any increase will be followed by a diminution in consumption which will at once defeat the purpose of the tax. Men are living now in the greatest economy. There are a hundred applicants for every vacant place. Men reared in wealth and comfort, doctors in the law and in medicine and in engineering, are glad to act as copyists for a few dollars a month. The middle classes have been swept away. There are vast fortunes in the hands of a few; and misery and wretchedness in the homes of the millions. The lands are lying idle; and an industrious population is starving; and the workmen in the cities are demanding the bread that has not been put as seed into the soil. Before the invasion it used to be said at Rome that no one could die there of starvation or be sick and be uncared for; so many and so well regulated were the hospitals and houses of charity. But the revenues of these establishments have been seized and squandered; and we have seen the revengeful, hungry crowds surging through the streets of Rome, doing deeds of violence and clamoring for bread.

Even in the official report of 1883 the reporting officer said: "From 1870 to this day we have not made one step forward. The lasting political co-existence of a Pope and a King at Rome is to-day less probable than it was eleven years ago, especially since so great a lapse of time without results only places in relief the intrinsic difficulties of a favorable solution." That was just it. The difficulty was intrinsic, that is, essential, and hence insurmountable; and time has only placed it in greater relief.

When Rome was made the capital of Italy, the intention of the Piedmontese was to reduce the Papal influence at Rome. Florence would have served as a capital; and Naples would have made a far better one than Rome. But they were blind with hate and would not see what a writer in the *Dublin Review* (July, 1877), has well expressed: "It shows outwardly what it is inwardly, and no more reminds one of a secular capital than Jerusalem can have reminded one of Athens. It is not a fortified place, nor a commercial emporium, nor a city of pleasure; and its treasures of art are less visible than its treasures of religion. It is not an antiquity dating from the middle ages, nor a manufacturing metropolis of the nineteenth century. It is simply the Eternal City. To dream of converting it into something new and brilliant,—an Italian Paris, or perhaps an Italian Berlin—is to forget that spirit defies matter, and that traditions cannot die unless the spots over which they brood be sown with salt and made desolate."

*"Thou shalt sound the trumpet . . . and shalt proclaim resurrection to all the inhabitants of thy land: for it is the year of jubilee . . . Every man shall return to his possession, because it is the year of jubilee . . . because of the sanctification of the jubilee . . . you are strangers" (Leviticus, xxv.)*

WILLIAM POLAND, S.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

### A BENEDICTINE RESTORATION.

**I**N the spring of 1831 the French newspapers announced the old Priory of Solèsmes, near Sablé (Sarthe), was for sale. Few of the readers who saw the announcement knew what a story was contained in that simple word Solèsmes; fewer still could see in the simple fact of its changing owners that its history was about to repeat itself.

The foundation of this ancient priory dated from 1010, an epoch when the Benedictine Order in France was at the apogee of its splendor. It was in what have been called the ages of faith; it was, when the light of faith and halo of sanctity shed a brilliant lustre which relieved the darkness and semi-barbarism of feudalism. Its founder was a pious feudal lord, Geoffroy I. of Sarthe, called Geoffroy the Elder, who had already been very liberal to the Church and churchmen, and who bought the hill upon which the priory was built from his brother, Raoul de Beaumont, comte du Maine. It was at the close of his life he conceived the idea of making this foundation "for the redemption of his soul and those of his parents." At this time, the service man owed to God was the first preoccupation of fervent Christians who, if possessed of the world's wealth, would not die in peace unless they had devoted some portion of it to the erection of a church, a chantry or a monastery. In the eleventh century, and long after, they were more given to founding monasteries than secular churches. At this epoch the rule of St. Benedict was regarded as the most perfect model of the cloistral life in all western Europe, and the monks to whom Geoffroy confided his foundation were Benedictines.

A century before, Bernon had founded in Burgundy the famous abbey of Cluny (910), which, under St. Odo and his successors



had become the centre of an immense movement of renovation in the Church and among the people. St. Benedict had thus achieved a second victory over barbarism, still more decisive and more glorious than the first. Among the numerous monasteries of the Province of Maine which had risen from their ruins and flourished during this happy epoch of resurrection that of Saint Pierre de la Canture, established in the city of Le Mans by the bishop, St. Bertrand, in the seventh century, must be placed in the front rank. Geoffroy de Sablé wished that his new foundation should be subject to this great abbey, with the simple title of Priory, and placed, like the mother house, under the patronage of the Apostle St. Peter.<sup>1</sup>

The Church of the Priory of Solèsmes was dedicated, with imposing ceremony, by Avesgand, Bishop of Le Mans, in presence of Hubert, Bishop of Angers, and the Abbots of Canture and St. Vincent, Ingelband and Reynauld. Hugues I., Count of Maine, first confirmed the charter of foundation with the sign of the cross, and then Geoffroy de Sablé, Adelaide, his wife, Drogon, his son, and Raoul, his brother, the bishops and abbots appended their signatures. At the head of the monks who were to form the first community was placed Rambeul, the first Prior of Solèsmes. The founder, who endowed the priory with extensive lands, died soon after, and was interred in the church, as, subsequently, were his wife and sons, although all traces of their place of sepulture have disappeared. The monks, however, have not allowed his memory to disappear, and every year, on the anniversary of the dedication of the church, the charter of foundation is read in the refectory, to revive the recollection of his good deeds; and although the Revolution has swept away the patrimony he donated to the monastery, the Holy Sacrifice is offered for his soul, as if the monks still possessed it.

"The history of the Priory of Solèsmes is neither long nor varied. Situated in the country, and placed, from its foundation, under the dependency of a rich and powerful abbey, it never had any existence apart, and could not, for that reason, acquire great renown. For eight centuries this peaceful dwelling was open to the friends of solitude and prayer. Unknown to the world, and very often misunderstood, pure virtues shone in its enclosure, and if human weakness was sometimes displayed there, what house, built by men, after so many centuries, ever presented annals wholly exempt from those stains which God alone has a right to remark, since He alone is holy?" Thus, summed up in a few lines traced by a master hand,<sup>2</sup> is the whole history of the monastery.

<sup>1</sup> *Solèsmes et Dom Gueranger*. Par le R. P. Dom Alphonse Guepin.

<sup>2</sup> Guéranger: *Essai historique sur l'Abbaye de Solèsmes*.



During the second half of the eleventh century Maine became a debatable ground, possession of which was competed for by the Dukes of Normandy, Counts of Anjou and others. To secure their liberty, the monks sought to have their domains guaranteed to them by each of these rivals. In 1073 the monks of Cantorbéry submitted the charter of Solèsmes to William the Conqueror for his ratification. A little later—and, doubtless, unknown to the English monarch, the monks obtained the same favor from Geoffrey III. and Foulques, his brother—both rival claimants for the county of Anjou. At the same time the charter was confirmed by two sons of the founder.

After the death of William the Conqueror the struggle for preminence in Maine was continued by his son Robert and Count Hugues, the latter having gained the upper hand in the capture of the province. Bishop Hôel, who had espoused the cause of the Norman party, fled from his episcopal city and took refuge at Solèsmes, making the priory church his cathedral, returning the inhabitants of Le Mans constrained Hugues to make peace with that prelate.

In February, 1096, Pope Urban II., who was preaching the crusade throughout France, came from Angers to Sablé, and then journeyed at Solèsmes. In the twelfth century a crusader of the family who were lords of the manor at Sablé gave the priory church a thorn from the crown of Thorns, which he had bought for a large sum from the Greeks in Constantinople. This generous donor was, doubtless, Robert IV. of Sablé, who joined the crusaders in 1158, had command of the fleet of Richard Cœur de Lion, and became Grand Master of the Templars. This relic is still preserved. In the age of faith pilgrims came in crowds to venerate it, and, at their request, the custom was established of carrying it in procession when any calamity afflicted the country. Its solemn exposition every Easter Monday was the origin of the assemblage held that day in the village of Solèsmes. The authenticity of the Holy Thorn has been more than once attested by miracles. Dom Alphonse Guepin records<sup>1</sup> that he was an eyewitness of a sudden cure effected by touching it.

In 1173, during the wars arising out of the repudiation of Eleanor of Aquitaine by the King of France, Louis VII., and her marriage with Henry Plantagenet, King of England and Duke of Anjou, the priory and village of Solèsmes had much to suffer from the English and Angevine troops.

In the thirteenth century, Pope Gregory IX. conferred by bull on the monks of Cantorbéry the right of celebrating the divine

<sup>1</sup> *Solèsmes et Dom Guéranger*. Par le R. P. Dom Alphonse Guepin. Le Mans, 1876, p. 25.

in times of interdict in their abbey and its dependencies. In the next century, the monks' exemplary lives inspired many benefactors to make donations of additional lands to the priory. The people participated in the prosperity of the monastery. The monks shared a large portion of their wealth with the poor and the working classes, constructing an embankment and lock, making the Sarthe navigable in this place.

In 1375, during the Hundred Years' War, the English troops who had ravaged the abbeys of St. Vincent and Canture, as well as several other monasteries of the province, did not spare Solès-mes. In 1408 Louis II., King of Sicily, Duke of Anjou, Count of Maine and lord of Sablé (father of the celebrated King René), made provision for the celebration of a daily Mass of Requiem for himself after his decease, an obligation which was faithfully fulfilled. Every morning, until the Revolution, after praise, the big priory bell was rung for "the King's Mass," and, after the dispersion, the remembrance of this pious institution long survived in the minds of the inhabitants of the village, as an incident characteristic of the old priory times.

About 1425 the English troops again laid waste the whole country and burnt the priory. A great portion of the archives shared the same fate. The sacrilegious devastators unwittingly took their punishment into their own hands. They gorged themselves with such a quantity of new wine and milk that they brought on a violent dysentery, of which most of them died.

After the disasters of the Hundred Years' War, the old priory arose from its ruins and reached a surprising degree of prosperity at a time when monasticism was almost everywhere on the decline. Hastily repaired after the ravages of the English soldiery, the edifice had lost, with its collateral naves, the amplitude of the basilica, and only a large chapel of irregular proportions, in which the remains of the solid buildings of the eleventh century ill accorded with the improvised portions of the fifteenth, subsisted. Without changing the general design of this modest church, the priors decorated it in a style that made it an almost unique monument of French monastic architecture. One of the priors of this epoch—known to history as the grand priors—encased the Holy Thorn in a silver-gilt shrine, supported by an angel of the same metal. Another, Dom Michel Burean, was raised to episcopal rank as titular Bishop of Hierapolis. Perhaps the most noteworthy was Jean Bougler, of whom an anecdote is related which well illustrates the spirit that animated the best types of churchmen in the Middle Ages. Passing across the hedge at Sablé one day to meet the lord of the manor, with whom he had had some trouble, his presence stirred up the anger of the haughty châte-

lain. "Monk," said he to the prior, "if I didn't fear God, I would throw you into the Sarthe." "If you fear God," was the reply, "I've nothing to fear." This prior reformed the observance, and under his wise administration monastic studies, for which the French Benedictines have been long famous, flourished.

We now come to a phase of monasticism which had a very deteriorating influence upon it. The rule of St. Benedict and the constant tradition of the monastic order laid down the principle that the abbot of each monastery should be a monk elected by his peers. From the earliest times, however, public or private necessity sometimes constrained the sovereign pontiffs to place a monastery under the guardianship of a secular prelate, who governed it and drew the revenues without being obliged to embrace the monastic state. These innovations were multiplied since the sojourn of the popes at Avignon; and kings, seeing in the commenda an easy and legal way of enriching their creatures at the expense of the monastic orders, strove to establish this régime; calling the holding of abbeys *in Commendam*, in all the monasteries in the various states. In France, this abuse largely prevailed, and dealt a fatal blow at monasticism from which it did not recover itself for a long time. An abbey *in Commendam* was a body without a head, doomed to decadence. In vain the sovereign pontiffs multiplied precautions to limit the power of the *Commendataires* and safeguard the interests of the monks against their rapacity. These measures were almost always ineffectual. In the Concordat concluded between the Pope and the King of France, Leo X. was unable to stipulate that all the abbeys *in Commendam* should be conformed to the rule; that is, placed under the government of abbots, elected by the professed, of the Order of St. Benedict. He stipulated that at least no monastery having a regular abbot should be placed *in Commendam*; but the Court of France began at once to evade this in a thousand ways, this clause protective of monastic freedom.

After the death of Dom Michael Burean, on June 6, 1556, Francis I. made the Bishop of Senlis abbot commendataire of the Abbey of Canture, upon which Solèsmes depended. The monks made a last stand for religious liberty, and elected Jean Bougler; but they had to yield to superior force after undergoing imprisonment. Bougler returned to his priory of Solèsmes, which he continued to govern for nearly forty years more, enriching the church with some valuable sculptures, which have been ever since the admiration of artists. He died on April 11, 1596, and was interred in the Chapel.

After the death of Prior Bougler, the priory was immediately placed *in Commendam*, and the epoch of its decadence began. Its decline and fall were hastened by the religious wars of the

Maine was one of the provinces of France which suffered most. History records with what iconoclastic fury the Protestants demolished every monument of Catholic piety upon which they could lay their ruthless hands. The sacking of the churches of Maine in 1562 was the beginning of innumerable destructive ravages. Masters of Sablé in 1567, the Huguenots laid siege to Solèsmes, and met with a stout resistance from the monks and a portion of the people, who barricaded the church. Unable to force the doors, the besiegers were preparing to set fire to them, but were put to flight by a vigorous sortie. In 1589 Landebry, who held the castle of Sablé in the name of Henry IV., took away the big bell of Solèsmes to have cannons cast from it; but it was recaptured by the people and hung in the belfry of the parish church.

Among the commendatory abbots of Canture who succeeded were Cardinal Charles de Bourbon, the King of the League, and his nephew, the Cardinal de Vendôme. Even in the darkest days of its decadence some of the monks of Solèsmes were true to their vocation, and their names are held in benediction. The abbey of Canture was reformed in 1657 by monks of the Congregation of Saint Maur, and the reform was extended to Solèsmes, which was the one hundred and fifty-first monastery reformed by that Congregation, two professed monks of that branch being successively nominated priors in 1670. It obtained possession of the bodies of the martyrs, Boniface, Maximus, Vital and Juliana, brought from the Roman Catacombs, and translated, in 1673, in the midst of a great concourse of clergy and people. Arnould Blouyn, nominated administrator of Solèsmes by the Chapter General of Saint Maur in 1672, carried in his hands the Holy Thorn in the procession. A young girl from Sablé, aged eighteen, who had been for four years suffering from an incurable disease, was miraculously cured during this translation; and every year, on the feast of the holy martyrs, she came to the priory church to return thanks to God.<sup>1</sup> These relics disappeared at the French Revolution; but in 1837 Cardinal Odescalchi presented the priory with the remains of St. Leontius, discovered in the crypt of St. Cyriacus.

The reform of Solèsmes by the congregation of Saint Maur secured the monastery a century and a half of an honorable existence; but, Dom Guepin says, it was not a *renaissance*. "Among all the cloistral priors who succeeded at Solèsmes, not one had or could have had that character of doctor and father without which there is no real superior in a Benedictine monastery. Jean Bougler had no successor before Dom Gueranger."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dom Guepin, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Dom Guepin, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

The fatal hour at last came. Misunderstood and perverted, an unmindful and unforeseeing age, cunningly oppressed by royalty and nobility, deprived of its natural government and the necessary developments of its inner life, scoffed at by the philosophers, foundations in some places undermined by heresy, the monastic institution was ready to crumble ; but in falling it covered France with its ruins and left a void in the Church and society which nothing could fill.<sup>1</sup> In 1790 the decree of the Constituent Assembly, which suppressed all the religious orders, gave its death stroke to the Priory of Solèsmes. At the opening of 1791 the monks were driven from their monastery and on the 4th of April of that year Solèsmes and the greater portion of its lands were bought by M. Lenois de Chanteloup who closed the church.

The abandonment of the monastery of Solèsmes lasted forty years. In 1817, sixteen years after the Concordat had restored Catholic worship in France, some monks of Saint Maur, assembled at Senlis, made an unsuccessful attempt to revive their congregation. It seemed to be all over with the Benedictine Order in France ; but God had decided otherwise, and the future restoration of this venerable institution was already a lad of twelve, not from the deserted monastery itself.

Prosper Louis Pascal Gueranger, born at Sablé, April 4, 1805, in what was formerly the convent of the Elizabethines in that town, was scarcely two years old, when his father, Pierre Gueranger, established in the old guest house of Solèsmes the college founded in 1602 by Olivier L'Evêque. It was there Prosper spent his whole childhood. He used to tell towards the close of his life how, when he was three and upwards, he was wont to point out to his mother the old priory as the limit of his walks. He thus very early became familiarized with the place which was to be the scene of his work. An aptitude for the ecclesiastical state and sacred studies soon displayed itself. He read with avidity and at twelve knew heart Fleury's Ecclesiastical History ; and seemed to be as familiar with the topography of the Holy Land as a pilgrim from Palestine. He was sent in 1818 to the Royal College of Angers with his fellow-students, with that insight into character which he sometimes surprisingly evince, named him "the monk." It was unconsciously prophetic. The writings of Joseph de Maistre which he found in the library of the Abbé Pasquier, chaplain to the college, first implanted in his mind an attachment to the Holy See and an aversion to the Gallicanism which grew with his growth. From Angers he passed to the seminary of Le Mans where he began his theology, adding thereto the study of history, the Fathers

other sources of tradition. Feeling that a life of combined study and liturgical prayer could alone satisfy his aspirations, and seeing in France no house in which the monastic's life was lived as he dreamed of it, he thought of going to Monte Cassino. His appointment as secretary to Mgr. de La Myre-Marry, bishop of Le Mans, dispelled these reflections for the moment. On October 7, 1827, he was ordained by Mgr. de Montblanc, Archbishop of Tours, and on the evening of that very day went to the old monastery of St. Martin, Marmoutier, to place his new life under the patronage of one who is a type of the priest and the apostle as well the patriarch of the monastic life in the West. Within these precincts where ages ago "the pealing anthem swelled the note of praise," he found nothing but silence and desolation. Church and monastery were destroyed; the foundations alone were visible. Heart-wrung at this spectacle, the young priest fell upon his knees and the *Rorate*, that prayer which the Church borrows from the prophets to depict the mourning of Jerusalem escaped from his lips.

Mgr. de La Myre having resigned his see, the Abbé Gueranger accompanied him in the spring of 1828 to Paris, where the reaction against Gallicanism was then in all its intensity and into which he threw himself with ardor, contributing to the "Memorial Catholique" four or five articles bearing on the Roman liturgy to which he had conceived a strong attraction. On the death of Mgr. de La Myre in the autumn of 1829, he was appointed to the parish of the Missions-Etrangères of which the Abbé Dufriche-Desgenettes was then curé. In 1831 he published his first book, a "Treatise on the Election of Bishops."

Meanwhile the old Priory of Solèsmes, which had passed from the possession of M. Lenoir de Chanteloup into that of three rich landowners, who had hoped to make a good thing out of these vast and solidly constructed buildings, was, as previously stated, offered for sale, the speculators not having realized their expectations and being anxious to get their own again out of them. The Abbé Gueranger resolved to save this monument of French monasticism at any cost. He first addressed himself to De Lammenais, whose acquaintance he had made when the editor of the *Avenir* was still a man of light and leading among the ardent spirits whom he had gathered around him in Paris, and before the author of the "Essays on Indifference" had fallen a victim to intellectual pride. He asked him to buy Solèsmes, to establish therein that Congregation of St. Peter, one of the chimerical projects of the great writer. The response was a refusal.

It then occurred to Gueranger to re-establish the Benedictines there. After much thought and prayer he communicated his de-

sign to two or three other priests, who approved of it. On the 1st of July, 1831, he crossed the threshold of the old monastery in company with a few friends. At the sight of the abandoned church, the bare altar, the empty stalls, and the beautiful statuary doomed to almost inevitable destruction, the emotion which had seized him in contemplating the ruins of Marmoutier again filled his heart, and he and the Abbé Fonteinne, vicaire of Sablé, joined the other voices in chanting the *Rorate*. Since the last Mass had been celebrated by the monks in 1791, no priest's voice had ever been raised there. Those two poor, almost unknown young priests, with the wealthy people at their back, were the future Abbot of Solé and the first and faithful companion of his labors. There was a powerful and generous nobleman to restore to the servants of God their temporal inheritance. The humble and fervent Christians who were the devout spectators of this scene were to accompany with a modest fortune what the wealthy had no longer the faith to undertake.<sup>1</sup> Mdme. Gazean, whom the whole town of Sablé revered as the mother of the poor, labored for the new work with the abnegation and ardent charity of a saint. Other helpers came forward in the persons of the Marquis de Dreux-Brézé, M. Swetchine, foremost in every good work, and Montalembert, the historian of the "Monks of the West." But their efforts had produced comparatively trifling results. It needed a year to mature the design. Around the Abbé Gueranger some of the younger clergy of Le Mans gathered sympathetically, but, while they encouraged the young founder, no effective steps were yet taken. The bishop, Mgr. Carron, was slow to give his approval to a work which did not exist in the mind of a young priest of twenty-six, admired for his spirit and erudition, but whose mission in the Church was yet suspected.

In the autumn of 1832 it became imperatively necessary to act with decision and promptitude. The demolition of the monastery began. On the 8th of November Mgr. Carron urged the Abbé Gueranger to stop it, and promised to give favorable consideration to the constitutions required for the observance of the Benedictine rule by the future community. But Gueranger had only 20 francs (£20) given him by the Marquis de Dreux-Brézé. His prayers and encouragement of Visitation nuns of Le Mans was his chief reliance in this extremity. He joined with them in a novena to the Blessed Virgin, begun on December 7th, to end on the 15th, the octave of the Immaculate Conception. During the novena the Mdles. Cosnard, despite their limited means, undertook to supply the sum of 6000 francs (£240); and on Dec-

<sup>1</sup> Dom Guepin.



ber 14th the old monastery was legally conveyed to the future disciples of St. Benedict, who took possession of it the next day, the octave of the Immaculate Conception, the very day when the pious nuns were finishing the novena. Four days after, on December 19th, the bishop formally approved the constitution and gave the Church's sanction to the work. It was manifest that the Blessed Virgin had taken it under her patronage. So the French Congregation has always, on the 8th of every recurring December, renewed the act of consecration, which obliges it to honor with special devotion the mystery of the Immaculate Conception. At the same time the Abbé Gueranger placed his undertaking under the protection of the Sacred Heart, vowing to each an altar under that title in the Church of Solèsmes, if, after three years from the day of installation, he should be in a position to continue the work. This double consecration to two mysteries, which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, were the object of Jansenist blasphemies and hostile criticism, showed in what spirit the restorer of the Benedictine order in France meant to form his disciples.<sup>1</sup> "If it was worth the trouble of being epitomised," he said, in his old age, "my life was nothing else than a reaction against the Jansenist tendency."

The 11th of July, 1833, the Feast of the Translation of the Relics of Saint Benedict in France was the day fixed for the installation of the new community. Great and general was the emotion when the procession entered joyfully the sacred and long-deserted precincts, chanting the appropriate canticle, *In Convertendo Dominus Captivitatem Sion*. The episcopal delegate, the Abbé Phillippe Ménochet, having led the five aspirants to the monastic life to the stalls and the Abbé Gueranger to the prior's place, began the celebration of Mass, sung according to the Roman rite. The community, which from that day chanted the divine office in its integrity according to the Roman rite, did not adopt the monastic Roman rite until the Christmas of 1846. They took the name of Father and the qualification of Dom when they had received ordination, but still wore the dress of secular priests, only assuming the Benedictine habit on the feast of the Assumption, 1836.

The new foundation, like every other work meant to endure, had to stand the test of time and trials. The first and hardest trial was isolation. Around them they found nothing but indifference. With the exception of a few, none knew anything about their work, of which they realized neither the object nor the opportuneness. Within, all who joined them were far from being

---

<sup>1</sup> Dom Guepin.



steadfast. Of the handful of aspirants who entered only one remained permanently, the Abbé Fonteinne. But the courageous prior counted upon God, and God blessed the faith of his superior. In the spring of 1837 the work, though still in its infancy, was strong enough to obtain the approval of Pope Gregory XVI. He had been a Camaldulense monk and, consequently, a son of St. Benedict, as well as of St. Romuald. The Abbot of St. Paul Outside the Walls, Dom Vincent Bini, was authorized by the apostolic delegation to receive, in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff, the monastic profession of the prior of Solèsmes, a ceremony which took place in the basilica of St. Paul, on July 26, 1837. It was more than fortuitous coincidence, one of those present at the ceremony was the Abbé Lacordaire, whom the example and efforts of Gueranger shortly after determined to undertake the restoration of the Order of Friars Preachers in France. On the 1st of September the Pope gave his definite sanction to the new monastic revival. Letters issued under the seal of the Fishers' Ring, and beginning with the words *Innumeras inter*, raised the priory to the rank of an abbey and declared it the head of a congregation of the Order of St. Benedict, enacted under the authority of the Congregation of France, affiliated to that of Monte Cassino, heiress of the ancient Congregations of Cluny, Saint Maur, and Saint Vannes. The same brief instituted the Very Rev. Prosper Gueranger, Abbot of Solèsmes and Superior-General of this congregation. On October 31, 1837, eve of the Feast of the Saints, the new abbot took possession of his monastery and officiated for the first time in his abbatial church.

The subsequent career of the restorer of Solèsmes is written largely in the history of the contemporary church of France. The restoration of the Benedictine Order is closely associated with the restoration of the Roman liturgy in that country—subject upon which the learned Abbot of Solesmes brought to bear all the resources of his extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity. In the first and second volumes of his "*Institution Liturgiques*" (1840-41) he showed the injury that liturgical innovations had done to religion in France, and that the most effective means of reviving faith and drawing closer the ties which bound that country to the Holy See was to restore the Roman liturgy—a revolution in ritual which he lived to accomplish, despite the fact that all the dioceses, with the exception of twelve, had other liturgies, and that from all sides the Gallicans raised an outcry against what they denounced as "a conspiracy." Polemical pamphlets espousing both sides of the controversy multiplied.

<sup>1</sup> Dom Guepin.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 122, 123.

Gueranger, in a letter to the Archbishop of Rheims, entitled "*Le droit de la Liturgie*," posed the canonical question with his usual perspicacity, and in his "*Defence des Institutions Liturgiques*" (1844) replied to certain strictures of the Archbishop of Toulouse, and in 1846-47 answered Mgr. Fayel, Bishop of Orleans, in a new defence of the same work. "The effect of these replies," says Dom Guepin, "was crushing. From that time the cause was completely gained, and no serious man ventured to take in hand the cause of the Gallican liturgies. The first time he had audience of Pius IX., that saintly Pontiff greeted him with the exclamation, "Here's the restorer of the Roman liturgy in France." The far-sighted Pope divined the important consequences involved in this momentous change. At the end of the struggle (1851) appeared the third volume of the "*Institutions Liturgiques*." The first volume of his favorite and best-known work, the "*Année Liturgique*," had appeared in 1841. Death cut short its completion when, after having gone through the whole round of movable feasts, he had come to the octave of Corpus Christi and the feast of the Sacred Heart. "If I have done good to souls," he said, "it is by the '*Année Liturgique*.'" The discussion immediately preceding the promulgation of the Immaculate Conception was the next important controversy in which he took part. He was the first French prelate who promulgated the definition, and the abbatial church of Solèsmes was the first in France in which this unique prerogative of the Virgin Mother was solemnly acclaimed on December 16, 1854.

Meanwhile the new French Benedictine Congregation took more definite shape when, in 1853, Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, handed over to Abbot Gueranger the monastery founded by St. Martin of Tours at Ligugè, which he had restored and of which, on November 25th of that year, under the auspices of St. Catherine V. M., four monks of Solesmes took possession. This monastery was erected into an abbey on November 18, 1856.

The publication of the "*History of the Church and the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century*," by the Prince de Broglie, called forth from Dom Guéranger a series of thirty articles in the "*Univers*," in which he combated the new historical school that strove to banish the supernatural from the world and to explain all the phenomena of history from a purely rationalistic point of view. Other articles attacked the naturalist tendencies in philosophy and history, and he had the satisfaction of subsequently seeing the doctrines he had denounced formally condemned in the encyclical of December 8, 1864. He next arraigned theological naturalism in vindicating Mary of Agreda's "*Mystical City*" against the unmerited censure of the Sorbonne.

On July 11, 1865, another priory was added to the congregation at Marseilles, erected into an abbey on February 4, 1876, by Pius IX., who declared that Dom Gueranger's memory "would be eternally in benediction." With that absence of national exclusiveness which has always characterized truly Catholic minds, he had largely aided in promoting the restoration of the famous Abbey of Saint Martin's of Beuron, on the banks of the Danube, given to the German Benedictines by the Princess Catherine of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. In the year succeeding the foundation of the Marseilles monastery, on October 8, 1866, the Bishop of Le Mans laid the first stone of a Benedictine convent of nuns at Solèsmes under the invocation of St. Cecilia, and on the 14th of August, 1867, five choir and two lay sisters received the veil, making their profession on August 15, 1868, Dom Gueranger having, on November 22, 1867, sung pontifically, for the first time, the Mass of St. Cecilia in the midst of the new religious family.

The crowning act of Gueranger's busy life—busier by far than that of many who sneer at cloistered religious as "idle monks"—was the part he played in connection with the now famous and historical Vatican Council and the great work it accomplished—the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility and the final extinction of Gallicanism, which had contained the germs of a possible schism. Convoked to the council in his quality of abbot, but excused from attendance on account of his increasing infirmities, he nevertheless largely influenced its deliberations from the silence and solitude of his monastic cell, in which he penned his powerful pamphlet, "*La Monarchie Pontificale*," the marvellous and, as it were, spontaneous fruit of a theological maturity of which few examples could be cited, and in which the assembled Fathers of the Council found the solution so many sophisms had concealed.<sup>1</sup>

Such brilliant services did not pass unrecognized and unrewarded. Pius IX. had already nominated him Consultor of the Congregations of Rites and of the Index and conferred on him the privilege of wearing the *cappa magna* like prelates of the highest rank.

The completion of the conventual Church of the Benedictine nuns and the writing of a beautiful monograph on "St. Cecilia and Roman Society," filled up the remainder of his life. Growing weakness alone prevented him from adding to his other masterly works a life of St. Benedict. Although struggling against the malady which was only to end with his death, he went to Marseilles in mid-winter, 1874, to inaugurate the new Benedictine monastery. On his return to Solèsmes, after Matins on Christmas

Eve, he sang the genealogy of the Saviour in accordance with monastic usage, but at the *gloria in excelsis* he fainted and had to be carried away half inanimate. After this crisis they urged him in vain to take some rest. "I would wish to die standing like St. Benedict," he replied; alluding to the heroic fortitude with which the patriarch and law-giver of the Monks of the West met death face to face. If this wish was denied him, his closing hours were none the less a suggestive reflex of his whole life. Death almost surprised him in the humble ministry of preparing a child for its first communion. A violent fever laid him prostrate, and, after an agony of three days, while the monks, gathered round his death-bed, renewed their profession in his hands and chanted those solemn psalms which have for ages made music in the ears of young and old, he quietly passed away on Saturday, the 30th of January, 1874.

The body of the venerated Abbot of Solèsmes was borne in procession to the abbatial Church of St. Cecilia, where the nuns kept watch by it during the night. Representatives of nearly all the religious orders, an immense concourse of priests, and the civil and military authorities of the department were present at the obsequies on the next day, when Mgr. d'Outremont, Bishop of Le Mans, pronounced a touching allocution. At the Month's Mind an eloquent and more elaborate panegyric was delivered by Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, of whom the Abbot himself had said one day in private conversation with one of his monks: "If you wish that one with a knowledge of the subject should speak of me after my death, it is the Bishop of Poitiers who should be invited to do so." But worthily as Mgr. Pie discharged the task allotted to him, it was the Pope himself in his brief, *Ecclesiasticis viris*, of March 19, 1875, who paid the highest tribute to his worth and work. "Among the Churchmen of our time the most distinguished by their religion, zeal, learning and skill in promoting Catholic interests must be justly inscribed our dearest one, Prosper Gueranger, Abbot of St. Peter's, Solèsmes and Superior-General of the Benedictines of the Congregation of France. Endowed with a powerful mind, possessing marvellous erudition and deep knowledge of canon law, he devoted the whole of his long life to courageously defending in writings of the highest value the doctrine of the Roman Church and the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, defeating the efforts and refuting the errors of those who combated them. And when, with the applause of Christendom, we by a solemn decree confirmed the heavenly privilege of the Immaculate Conception of the holy Mother of God; and, quite recently, when, with the approval of a numerous attended council which brought together bishops from all parts of the Catholic world, we defined

the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff teaching *ex cathedrâ*, our dear son Prosper did not fail in his duty as a Catholic writer : he published works full of faith and sacred science which were a fresh proof of his superior mind and his unshakable devotion to the Chair of St. Peter. But the chief object of his labor and his thoughts was to restore the Roman liturgy in France to its ancient rights. He carried out this undertaking so well, that it is to his writings, and, at the same time, to his singular skill more than to any other influence that we owe it that, before his death, all the dioceses in France were seen to adopt the rites of the Roman Church. His life, wholly employed we may say in the interests of the Catholic cause, adds the eclat of a new splendor to the Benedictine Congregation of France, already illustrious in so many other ways and seems to demand from us new testimony of our good will and affection." Again in the brief, *Decebat Profecto*, of March 29, 1875, addressed to Mgr. Pie, he refers to him as "the most brilliant glory of the Order of St. Benedict" and "a providential instrument for the restoration of the ruined religious orders in France and to make manifest to all their very great utility," and attributes to her "laborious activity, grace and science," that "identity of opinions among all true Catholics, that universal devotedness and truly filial laws by which France is united to the Holy See."

R. F. O'CONNOR.

---

## CATHOLIC PROTECTORIES AND REFORMATORIES.

THE motives which have led to the establishment of institutions for the relief of the poor, the correction of the criminal, the care of orphans and widows, the reformation of juvenile delinquents, the education of the ignorant, the treatment and cure of disease, the care of the insane, the protection and education of the deaf, dumb and blind, and, in fact, for the relief of all the temporal misfortunes of mankind, may be classified under three principal heads—Charity, Philanthropy and Public Policy—these have been the chief motives for these great and varied works of amelioration. The first of these motives, charity, is the distinguishing incentive which has actuated Christianity, the Christian Church and its members. Philanthropy has supplied the reason for such works by man, as a member of the human family, actuated by motives of humanity; and Public Policy is that which leads to such measures on the part of the sovereign, the nation, the people, the state.

Charity is the highest, the purest and the most perfect motive for good—the corner-stone of the Christian Church; for without charity Christianity could not exist. Not only is it one of the theological virtues, but it is the greatest of them, and far transcends the noble virtues of faith and hope. It is one of the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost. That splendid eulogy which St. Paul pronounces on charity in the thirteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians should be engraved on every human heart. It leaves nothing for human pen to write. The Saviour Himself hath also said, “By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, because ye love one another.”

Animated by this greatest of virtues, Christianity has in every age proved its divine origin by its magnificent charities. Scarcely a work of mercy in the world but is either of Christian origin or is an imitation of Christian works or traces its inspiration therefrom. In the earliest ages the poor were taken care of from a common fund, and by an ancient regulation one-fourth of the Church's revenues were expended for the poor. When the Church had acquired strength and had evangelized the nations, there sprang from her fruitful womb those benevolent religious orders, whose sole motive and occupation were works of charity. Charity for the human soul and charity for the human body went hand-in-hand together. Among the earliest works of Christian

charity was the double order or institute of Fontevrand for penitents both male and female, which achieved miracles of mercy in France, Spain and England. As early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Church had apostolic men preaching and laboring for the redemption of fallen women, thus giving the nineteenth century the models for its Magdalen asylums. The ransom of slaves became a leading work of mercy; Christians even became slaves in order to manumit the slaves; and these exalted works bore fruit in the abolition of slavery in many lands. Woman was emancipated from the thralldom in which heathenism had placed and left her. Missions and institutes were founded for teaching Christian doctrine to the young. The Trinitarians were an order of Fathers for the redemption of Christian slaves, and as early as the thirteenth century the ancient order of Mercy existed and had its saints and martyrs. The ancient order of Religious Penitents, or White Daughters, as they were called, were the precursors of our modern Magdalens. Hospitals for the relief of every form of suffering sprang up in every land; the poor, the lepers, the insane, exiles—all had their special homes, institutes and hospitals. Charitable institutions were as numerous as the forms of human wants and sufferings. Ingenuity varied the provision to the necessity, and was untiring in spreading intelligence, in bestowing the gifts of Christian charity, in dispensing her treasures and distributing her succors. Such was the elevation attained by the institutes of mercy that religion not only soothed the sorrows of humanity, but she most tenderly regarded the imperfections of the sufferers, practiced a refined and delicate condescension and a gentle regard for human self-love and for the frailties of the race. Well has it been said that such great works of mercy as the Christian membership has performed from the motive of charity, since the divine accomplishment of our redemption, would be accepted by heaven as an ample atonement for the sins of mankind. Well has a great Catholic writer exclaimed: "Heavenly religion, that compels us to love those wretched beings by whom it is calumniated!"

So, too, has it been with works of education; for charity did not stop at instructing the soul in Christian doctrine and in relieving human suffering. It aspired also to the achievement of great results in the education of the mind and character of men. The teaching orders of the Church have shown the same energy of goodness as the various orders of mercy and foreign missions. Conspicuous among these have been the Benedictines and the Jesuits. But in our times the teaching orders of the Catholic Church, both male and female, have become both numerous and beneficent. Countless schools, colleges and universities—in the

past eminently, and in the present pre-eminently—attest the charities of the Catholic Church in the education of the human intellect and in the formation and reformation of the human character and conscience.

It would require many volumes to give an adequate account of the great Christian labors for the amelioration of human suffering and of the splendid institutions of charity by which the Catholic Church has illustrated her divine mission and sanctified her career in every age. We have been able in this paper to make but a faint allusion to them. In our own country she has been true to her mission and traditions, and the charities of the Church in America are worthy of the most glorious ages and nations of Christendom. Let us briefly glance at her latest compiled statistics of education and charity. In 1894 the Catholic Church in the United States had nine universities, one hundred and eighty-two high schools for boys and six hundred and nine for girls, and three thousand seven hundred and thirty-one parochial schools, in which a gratuitous education was given to seven hundred and seventy-five thousand and sixty future citizens of the republic. These future citizens and defenders of our country are taught in these Catholic schools their duty to God, to their fellow-citizens and their country. The Catholic teachings on the subject of our relations and duties to our country were well expressed in the address of Cardinal Gibbons to the Baltimore Catholic Club, when he said, "In no country on the face of the earth has the difficult problem been better solved than in the United States—the problem of maintaining harmonious relations between Church and State. Here the Church and State run in parallel lines, and do not conflict with one another. The Church upholds the State; religion educates the State, and proclaims the divinity of the laws under which we live. Religion tells us that there is no authority but from God, and that all law is sacred. Religion sanctifies the virtue of obedience and respect for civil laws by teaching that obedience to civil authority is not a servile homage paid to man, but a homage of freemen to God Himself."

But the Catholic Church has also cause to glory in her institutions of charity in America. Here she has two hundred and thirty-nine orphan asylums maintaining and educating thirty thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven inmates for the duties of American citizenship in accordance with the principles announced by Cardinal Gibbons. She has also eight hundred and one other charitable institutions, such as hospitals, protectories, reformatories, nurseries, homes, missions and similar institutions of mercy and relief. The whole number of persons educated and supported in our Catholic institutions in 1894 was the grand



total of eight hundred and sixty thousand three hundred and fifty-six.

We desire particularly to mention these Christian treasures in the State of Pennsylvania and in the city of Philadelphia, because they are the home of our REVIEW and because they have a special bearing upon a branch of our subject. In the State of Pennsylvania Catholics maintain, besides Catholic colleges, sixty high-schools, three hundred and twenty-one parochial schools, in which are educated seventy-two thousand Catholic children, eighteen asylums and thirty-three other charitable institutions. In the archdiocese of Philadelphia, besides three colleges, there are eighteen high-schools, ninety-eight parochial schools, which educate over thirty-two thousand Catholic children, ten asylums, with thirty-three hundred and thirty-two inmates, and in twenty-three other charitable institutions are maintained and educated, together with the inmates already enumerated, a grand total of thirty-nine thousand seven hundred and eighty persons.

Reformatories and protectories occupy a pre-eminent position among the works which have been prompted either by charity, philanthropy or public policy. They are the most direct efforts to solve the paramount problem of the child and to obey the injunction of our Saviour to permit little children to come unto Him and to forbid them not. The efforts of the Catholic Church and of her followers in the direction of protectories and reformatories have far excelled all others, whether actuated by charity, philanthropy or public policy. They have gone farther than any other institutions in solving the child problem and in enabling the State itself to solve it. This we expect to prove by disinterested testimony. And we think that we can show that Catholic institutions of this character are the best agents of the State in the execution by the State of one of its most sacred, difficult and important duties. And, further, that, while this function of the public economies is better performed, it is more economically executed than by the institutions for the same purpose founded and managed by the State. The State is fortunate in securing the agency of private institutions for the performance of this great and paramount public service.

There are many questions that enter into the consideration of this subject, such as the recognition by the State of its duty to take charge of, care for and educate properly its juvenile delinquents and vagrants and all such children as, by their poverty, viciousness, intemperance and neglect of their parents, are thrown upon the public for care, support and education. Such, too, is the important question of the paramount importance of religion as a part of every education and the absolute right of every indi-

vidual within the territories of the State, "all mankind," whether child or adult, freeman or prisoner, man or woman, innocent or guilty, pauper or criminal, to the full enjoyment of religious liberty and freedom of conscience and religious worship. All these shall receive a share of our attention.

Eminent among the charitable institutions of the Catholic Church throughout the Christian world, to which we have had but space for a passing allusion, are her splendid protectories and reformatories. Among the leading institutions of this kind a very few are the Catholic Refuge at Anteuil, Paris; Issy, Mettray and other similar ones in France; the Catholic Reformatory of St. Kevin, in the county Wicklow, and the Catholic Industrial School of Artane, near Dublin. In the United States we can mention with Christian pride the New York Catholic Protectory, the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin for the Protection of Homeless and Destitute Children, which has one of its houses in Lafayette Place, New York City, and the other at Mount Loretto, on Staten Island, New York State; the Boland Trade School, the Institutions of the Sisters of Mercy, St. Ann's Home for Destitute and Homeless Children, the Institution of the Sisters of St. Dominic, the Foundling Hospital, the House of the Holy Family for Befriending Children and Young Girls, St. Agatha's Home for Children, at Nanuet; there being in the city of New York alone no less than nine industrial and reform schools; the Catholic Protectory, at Buffalo; St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys, near Baltimore; House of the Angel Guardian and the Homes for Destitute Catholics, at Boston; six industrial schools in the archdiocese of Chicago; St. Francis de Sales Industrial School for Boys, at Eddington, in Pennsylvania; four industrial schools and reformatories in St. Louis; three asylums and protectories in the archdiocese of St. Paul; one industrial school in San Francisco; two industrial schools in Brooklyn; a protectory and a reformatory for girls in Cleveland; an industrial school at Seattle; three industrial schools and reformatories in the Diocese of Newark; two industrial schools and protectories at Pittsburgh; three industrial schools in the diocese of St. Cloud; one protectorate in Winona; and Magdalen asylums, orphan asylums and other charitable institutions for both sexes which greatly partake of the work and aims of Catholic protectories and reformatories, too numerous throughout the length and breadth of our country to be particularly named.

What have eminent and learned Protestants themselves said of these Catholic institutions? What have they testified to in regard to these Catholic institutions as the very best agents and servants of the State in the great and good works which public policy and

public duty have impelled the State to undertake? The late George William Curtis, as distinguished for his eloquence and learning as for his patriotism and public spirit, said: "It is impossible not to recognize the fact that the charitable foundations of the Roman Church are the most comprehensive, the most vigorous and the most efficient known in history. . . . I cannot stop to speak of the various forms of the charity of that Church; but it is to one of its saints that civilization owes the institution of the Sisters of Charity, whose benign service is known even in the hospitals of other denominations." The *New York Observer*, a thoroughly Protestant journal, devoted five weekly articles, beginning in April 20, 1893, to detailed and eulogistic accounts of the charities of the Catholic Church in New York to what it calls "this far-reaching array of philanthropic works." The Rt. Rev. Dr. Doane, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Albany, referring to distinctively Catholic institutions of charity, said before the New York Constitutional Convention in 1894: "I honor the Roman Church from the bottom of my heart for the stand she has taken in her ministries to the sick and to the poor." And the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, the president of that convention, said: "The church that I refer to in particular"—the Roman Catholic—"has, so far as I can learn, led the way in charitable work, and has been an example to all other churches, and the great business of churches of all kinds, so far as I can understand the present theory of church organizations, centers in charity—doing good to our fellow-men." The eminent speaker who gave this last testimony in favor of Catholic works of charity is a witness worthy of special weight, since he is the president of the New York State Charities Aid Society and a member of the board of trustees of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. These tributes to our institutions of charity are selected from countless others on account of—we will not say their hostility to the Catholic Church—but of the well-known disinterestedness and standing of the witnesses.

While Catholic protectories and reformatories constitute the smallest number in kind of our Catholic institutions, since they are only needed in large cities, they constitute, where needed, the most important. If space permitted, we would like to give a detailed account of the great institution at Paris, where workshops are conducted for instructing the boys in engraving, carving, manufacturing instruments of precision, where a practical manufacturer presides over each trade, and where the inmates are thoroughly instructed by the Christian Brothers in Christian doctrine and in the practice of Christian morals and precepts. We would like to speak in detail of the great protectory at Artane, where the finest

ecclesiastical music is produced by a choir of boys led by one of their own number; where secular and religious instruction is zealously imparted; where a small boy can produce a pair of stockings in fifteen minutes; where beautiful rosaries and crucifixes are wrought; where tasteful Glengary caps are made, blouses by young tailors, shoes by young shoemakers, complete sets of harness are made and mounted in silver-plated ware; and where the carpenter shops exhibit such splendid work. There are several such institutions in Europe, and our own country is not without such jewels to bear witness of the ever-active charity of the Catholic Church.

The two most extensive and successful Catholic institutions of the kind in this country are those of the "Mission of the Immaculate Virgin for the Protection of Homeless and Destitute Children," which is a noble example of protectories exclusively as such; and the "New York Catholic Protectory," which happily and signally combines the features, the works and the benign results of both protectory and reformatory.

The Mission of the Immaculate Virgin is purely a protectory, for the tests of admission to its blessings are restricted to the homeless or friendless. Juvenile delinquency forms no feature in its two institutions, one of which is located in Lafayette Place, in the City of New York, where three hundred and ninety-five boys are kept; and the other at Mount Loretto, on Staten Island, where on an extensive estate there are thirteen hundred and fifty-four boys and one hundred and thirty-three girls. At both these institutions the buildings are numerous, spacious and enduring. The whole number of homeless and friendless children provided for is sixteen hundred and ninety-one, of whom fifteen hundred and twenty-nine are boys, and the remainder are girls. This noble institution was founded by Father John Drumgoole, a man whose humility and charity were saintly, and whose good deeds were countless. The present number of clergymen in charge is four, and there are twenty-seven sisters, twenty-seven lay teachers, with male help eighty-two, and female help eighty-six.

This good work of looking after the more tender waifs of the City of New York was commenced by the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; then Cardinal McCloskey appointed "Father John," as he was familiarly known, at his own request, to take charge of the work, which needed a head. St. Joseph's Union was formed in 1876, the members of which throughout the country contributed only twenty-five cents a year; and the good Father established a little newspaper called *The Homeless Child and Messenger of St. Joseph's Union*, a copy of which is still sent to each of the members, now numbering several hundred thousand. Certain spiritual

benefits have been secured to the members. This vast institution was started in a hired house, No. 55 Warren Street; now the buildings at the northeast corner of Bond Street and Lafayette Place are equal to any institutional buildings in the city.

The estate at Mount Loretto comprises six hundred and fifty acres of land, three hundred of which are cultivated by the boys. The main building, which stands in the centre of this magnificent farm, cost \$500,000, a large and imposing structure, capable of accommodating nearly two thousand boys. On the estate is a bathing establishment, an immense stable, a curiosity to see, in which are kept one hundred and twenty-five head of cattle, sixty-nine horses, six hundred pigs, one hundred sheep, and thousands of chickens. It is said to be the largest stable in the Empire State. Around the central building, or home of the boys, are conveniently grouped the different shops and the houses in which reside the master-mechanics, who instruct the boys in their different trades, which are numerous and useful ones. The boys are divided into seven classes, commencing with the nursery and gradually culminating in the rank of apprentices. After a boy has served out his apprenticeship, he is promoted to the Trades Hall, where his industrial training is proportionately advanced, and now as a "trades boy" he is transferred to a separate part of the dormitory, and in a different part of the main building. He has the use of a fine library, chooses his own clothes at the tailoring establishment, and is distinguished on Sundays by the white shirt he wears. On mastering his trade, he is promoted to the Free Trade Hall, and it often happens he attains to a "professorship" in the very institution where he commenced. The ages of the boys range from four to twenty-one years, a class between the orphan and the juvenile delinquent. On entering the Free Trade Hall the boy receives a weekly salary, has a private bedroom of his own, is trusted with liberty of going and coming at pleasure, can attend places of innocent amusement, and is only placed under the restriction of not visiting places where intoxicating liquors are sold. Good positions are procured in the city for the advanced trades boys, who continue to reside at the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin, in Lafayette Place, for which they pay a nominal price of one or two dollars per week. Boys showing superior minds are sent to college, and there are now eight or more of the boys studying for the priesthood. One of the Mount Loretto boys is receiving a first-class musical education, and another is studying medicine. Some of the trades taught are tailoring, shoemaking, printing and such like. The Institution is primarily intended for boys, but the girls thrown in its way by Providence are received, and these are provided with the best accommodations in St. Eliza-

beth Home, where they, too, are instructed in useful handicraft and trades, and they make themselves useful in darning the stockings and mending the clothes of the boys. There is a very fine battalion of military cadets, composed of the larger boys.

All the inmates of the Mission are reared up to be good Christians and worthy citizens. They all manifest the greatest gratitude to their benefactors, and the warmest affection for their Chaplains and the Sisters.

The *New York Observer* said, in 1893, of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin: "This Institution, which fills a gap between the orphan and the intractable boy, was founded twenty-five years ago by Father John Drumgoole, who has been styled the 'humblest and most benevolent of New York's priests.' Through his untiring energy, perseverance and admirable management, the work made rapid strides from a modest beginning to a noble self-supporting institution, caring for and instructing one thousand seven hundred boys and girls."

Among the admiring visitors to Mount Loretto in the lifetime of Father Drumgoole, was the Prime Minister of England, Lord Roseberry, who became an ardent admirer of "Father John" and his work, and a friend of one of the boys named "Pat," whom he afterwards sent to college. The following letter from Lord Roseberry to Father Drumgoole cannot but prove interesting:

MY DEAR FATHER:

I cannot get away to say good-bye to you to-day, but I must in the first place send my address to you: "2 Berkley Square, London, W.," that you may write and tell me how your good work is getting on, and how "Pat" is progressing and what money, from time to time, you want for him. And in the second place, I must express my thankfulness to have been brought face to face with you, and with your noble work. I have never left you or your house without feeling better for it, and without feeling that I had got an insight into a higher and holier life, than men are generally privileged to lead; or indeed capable of leading. I hope you may long be spared for it, and that I may have the pleasure of seeing you and your institution prospering and strengthening, every year more and more. Will you devote a little of Pat's money to having him photographed, and sending me a copy. God bless you, if that may be said without presumption to you, from

ROSEBERRY.

The Rev. John Drumgoole was also called the Don Bosco of America. His successor is the Rev. James J. Dougherty, under whose management the Mission is growing in usefulness and honor.

There are in every thoughtful and studious mind certain ideals: those conceptions of the perfect, which are accomplished by selecting and assembling into one the beauties and perfections of many. It is thus that the benefactors of their race, the philanthropic, the charitable, the friends of the child, the statesman, the Christian, the good Samaritan, and the benevolent, in studying the

child problem, have in their minds the conception of an ideal institution—a model protectory or reformatory. In the mind of the present writer the New York Catholic Protectory is such an ideal.

This institution is the first of its kind in America. Called into existence by the saddening necessities of a great city, it has bravely met an appalling demand of humanity upon Christian charity. It has done more than any other institution to solve the fearful problem of the child. It combines the features of protectory and reformatory. It extends its saving benefits with equal charity and zeal to the girl as well as to the boy. Secular and religious education are equally imparted to its inmates; the soul is trained for Heaven, the mind and character of the juvenile delinquent and vagrant recover their self-respect; industrial training is one of its leading features, and religion, patriotism and education unite in creating the Christian, the citizen, and an industrial producer in the general public economics of the nation.

The true character of the protectory can best be known from the three classes of children it is authorized to receive and care for by its charter. "1. Children under the age of fourteen years, who, by consent in writing of their parents or guardians, may be entrusted to it for protection or reformation. 2. Children between seven and fourteen years of age, who may be committed to the care of such corporation as idle, truant, vicious, or homeless children, by order of any magistrate in the city of New York empowered by law to make committal of children for any such cause. 3. Children of the like age who may be transferred, at the option of the Commissioners of Public Charities and Correction of the city of New York, to such corporation."

Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, a distinguished convert to the Catholic faith, after a pilgrimage to Rome and laying at the feet of Pius IX. the episcopal ring which had been placed on his finger when he was appointed the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina, was the founder and first president of the protectory. From the very start he had the sympathy and support of that illustrious prelate, John Hughes, the great Archbishop of New York. It was founded by private Catholic charities, and two years of steady growth and success passed before it was employed by the State of New York, as its agent, to perform that part of the municipal duty which public policy and public obligation imposed upon the State, in respect to the two classes of children, especially designated as 2 and 3 in the charter. This contract between the State and the chartered protectory related only to such Catholic children as fell within those two classes. All thought of proselytizing children not of the Catholic faith, was disclaimed, and the pledge has ever been faithfully redeemed. This was proven by a

correspondence between Mr. Louis Binsse, president of the Catholic Union and the present writer who was then secretary of the protectory, in which the secretary refuted the charge made by the Evangelical Alliance before the legislature that Protestant children were received and proselytized in the protectory. After stating the exactness with which the religion of all committed children is ascertained; how exceptions to the general rule of receiving only Catholic children, *though extremely few*, sometimes occurred at the special request of parents or children, the secretary's letter says: "Protestant or non-Catholic children have never been compelled in the protectory to attend Mass against their own or their parents' wills. I remember some years ago having made this very inquiry myself of the brother rector of the male department, and he informed me in the presence of the Executive Committee that there were then several Protestant boys in the protectory, and that they were permitted every Sunday to attend the services of the nearest Protestant Church, and a brother or other official of the protectory went thither and returned with them for their protection. The same thing will be done again whenever the same occasion arises for so doing." The secretary's letter then says: "The New York Catholic Protectory, as its name imports, is a Catholic Institution, and designed only for Catholic children. We advertise our true character to the world. We do not sail under false colors or under deceptive names. We do not claim the disingenuous style of non-sectarian, a term designating a system, which, when tested in the crucible of constitutional and social rights and guarantees, . . . proves to be the quintessence of sectarianism. The fact that we claim to be a Catholic institution and desire none but Catholic children to be committed to us, proves that we do not desire to interfere with the religious beliefs of Protestant children, or to have opportunities for proselytizing non-Catholic children." We will show later on that the creation of the Catholic protectory and the methods of the New York system, under which it now flourishes, tend greatly to prevent proselytism.

In his appeal to the Catholics of New York at the commencement of the Protectory, in 1863, Dr. Ives said: "Vast numbers of these defenceless young creatures are daily wandering over the face of this great city, exposed to all the horrors of hopeless poverty—to the allurements of vice and crime in every debasing and disgusting form. . . . Our object is to extend to these little sufferers a helping hand; to raise them from their state of degradation and misery, and to place them in a condition in which they may have a fair chance to work out for themselves a better destiny; to become, in short, instruments of good to society and an honor



to their race. . . . What higher motive of action, then, can we have than the knowledge or belief that our organization is to place within their reach the salvation of thousands of destitute Catholic children—children, who, under their present circumstances, are almost certain to lose their faith, and consequently to peril their souls. Those children are a special trust from Almighty God, and every Catholic, under authority of the Church, has a fearful responsibility in the matter of their salvation. It is not necessary that a Catholic should be a bishop or a priest to fix upon him this responsibility. It is true, bishops and priests are sent to direct and bless the work ; but, it is to be accomplished, in a considerable degree, by our co-operation. We are now called upon by the highest authority of the Church among us to give that co-operation. In truth, we go forth to the fulfilment of our trust under the special guidance and benediction of our Most Reverend Archbishop."

Archbishop Hughes, in introducing Dr. Ives to lecture before a large assembly in New York, in 1864, said, among many grand and noble words: "What I chiefly desire is, to avail myself of the first public opportunity afforded me to give assurance of the very sincere and earnest interest which I feel in the success of the noble work called the 'Catholic Reformatory.' It is a work which commends itself to the best sympathies and warmest charities of all. . . . The time, I trust, is not far distant, when this Catholic Reformatory will take its rank among the most flourishing of the many admirable institutions of charity which reflect so much honor on this metropolis, and which are hardly to be found surpassed in any city of the world ; when it will become a source of incalculable blessings to thousands of poor, destitute, vagrant children, who will find in it a safe refuge from the dangers and temptations to which they have been exposed ; where their spiritual as well as temporal wants will be duly cared for ; where they will be trained up in the knowledge of their holy faith, and in the practice of its holy precepts, and go forth afterwards to become sober, industrious, virtuous members of society."

The success of the Protectory has been phenomenal. Its present grand proportions, and immense benefactions, have been the joint results of private charity and of the compensation it has received during thirty years from the State of New York under an exact and fair contract, for performing for the State an important part of that public obligation which is inherent in the very organization of the State. These private charities, in the aggregate, may be conjectured when it is stated that a single fair held for the Protectory netted over \$100,000. From the ninth annual report (1872) we learn that from the foundation of the Protectory, in 1863, there

had been expended, for all purposes, \$1,430,706 85; all which was laid out in accordance with the requirements of the law. Of this sum the public contributed less than half, \$674,110.53, while private charities contributed \$756,593.32. It is estimated that the moneys received from the State, or rather from the city of New York, only suffice for the support of the inmates, the waifs of the city who are the wards of the Protectory; and the real estate and personal property accumulated in thirty-two years have been the result of private charities and efforts. Of this last sum, private benevolence contributed \$413,897.18; the labor of the children, \$102,791.52; and the credit of the Protectory, \$244,019.71. These figures, proportionately extended to 1895, would show the increased proportions relatively contributed by the public and by the Protectorate.

The work of this vast institution is conducted in three separate and distinct departments. The House of Reception at Nos. 415 and 417 Broome Street, in the city of New York; the male department located on the north side of the public highway leading to Van Nest station in West Chester county; and the female department on the south side of the same highway.

At the House of Reception are all the city business offices, the salesrooms for the shoe department, and the temporary home of the boys and girls as they are committed, and in which, under the care of the Sisters of Charity, they are provided with schooling, religious instruction and services, and properly prepared in point of health, for transfer to the West Chester institution. The term of detention at the House of Reception is the period of quarantine required by the health regulations of the city of New York.

The male and female departments at West Chester embrace extensive and massive buildings erected on a large farm purchased for the purpose, of which two-thirds are given to the male department and the remainder to the female department. The former is in charge of the Christian Brothers, about seventy-five in number, and the present rector is Brother Leontine. The latter is in charge of Sisters of Charity, forty in number, with Sister M. Anita as Superioress. In the schools at West Chester are taught catechism of Christian Doctrine, reading, spelling, arithmetic, penmanship, grammar, history, geography, free-hand drawing, linear drawing, stenography and typewriting. At the male department the following industrial trades are taught: Printing, electrotyping, shoe-making, tailoring, chair-caning, stocking-knitting, music, farming, dairy work, gardening, blacksmithing, wheelwright, carpentry, machinery, and painting. There is also a musical band and orchestra composed of Protectory boys, regarded as among the best in the city, and a battalion of two hundred cadets under thorough

military training. There are also in both institutions fine libraries. In the female department are taught dress-making, glove-making, shirt-making, cooking, stenography, typewriting, and other industries.

The incorporated Protectory is composed of lay trustees, and the mayor, recorder and controller of the city are *ex officio* members of the board. The presidents of the Protectory have been Levi Silliman Ives, Henry James Anderson, Henry L. Hogue, Richard H. Clarke and Bryan Lawrence.

That divine virtue which leads Christians to love God for His own sake, and to love the neighbor for the love of God, had no parallel in the ancient religions of the world, nor has it in any of the systems of modern society outside of Christianity. Philanthropy, on the other hand and in contrast with Christian charity, is a human sentiment, springing from natural motives. Humanity, rather than religion, is its motive power. Man is its object rather than God; the body, rather than the soul; time rather than eternity. Philanthropy springs from that repugnance which man feels towards human sufferings. Charity is a supernatural virtue; philanthropy is a human sentiment, not aspiring to, or reaching the elevation of a supernatural virtue. At most it is but a human virtue. Charity is always consistent with itself and with its divine origin. Philanthropy is good in the natural order, but its aims are earthly; its means are sometimes rash and faulty. Sometimes unjust in its measures, occasionally tyrannical in the exercise of power, and is liable to prove barren of results. But philanthropy, guided by experience, justice, and reason, is capable of achieving good and great results. Philanthropy is not inconsistent with the divine virtue of charity and, when yielding to the guidance of supernatural motives and seeking its purpose in God, may rise to the elevation of charity. But left to itself its aims are human, and when wholly divorced from religion and from the supernatural, it makes a religion of humanitarianism. It is not without its rewards, but its rewards are temporal. When guided in the individual by a pure and gentle benevolence and uprightness, and in the State by an enlightened statesmanship and even justice, it becomes an aid to true charity and a handmaid to religion. It is also capable of hostility to religion by not only ignoring it, but even by openly excluding or rejecting it; and of this last phase of philanthropy, we shall have occasion to mention a signal example in this paper.

Stephen Girard, of Philadelphia, may be mentioned as a prominent example of philanthropists. He was the son of a seaman and followed the sea like his father. From a cabin boy he rose to be a master, then a ship owner. He married the daughter of a ship builder; but his marriage was an unhappy one; he applied for a

divorce, and his wife died finally, insane, in a public hospital. During the American Revolution his maritime ventures were suspended, and he then made money as the owner of a grocery and liquor store in Philadelphia and Mount Holly. Resuming his shipping business after the war, wealth poured into his lap. Real estate ventures in Philadelphia were the principal foundation of his great fortune, and during the negro insurrection in Hayti, two of his vessels were in one of the ports of the island and received on board large amounts of treasure from Haytien planters for safe keeping; the planters and their entire families were cut off in the insurrection, and Mr. Girard thus became the possessor of \$50,000. With his capital and his strict business principles, he became one of the wealthiest merchants in the city. During the dreadful and unprecedented scourge of the yellow fever in 1793, '97 and '98, he became a public benefactor; not confining himself to liberal donations of money for the relief of the sufferers, but he gave himself personally to the duties of physician and nurse, performing even the most disagreeable offices for the sick in the hospitals, and for two months took charge of the hospital on Bush Hill. He subsequently went into the banking business. He was a liberal contributor to public works, city improvements and the adornment of the city. He built many handsome buildings. Frugality and parsimoniousness, sternness and exactness in his methods, characterized his dealings; but his benefactions showed that avarice was wholly absent from his character. His virtues and good deeds in the natural order received their reward, and in the war of 1812, he was able to lend the United States government \$5,000,000. With his great wealth his appearance and dress were exceedingly plain; he was uneducated; he was a free-thinker, an admirer of Voltaire, Rousseau and their school, and he was fond of naming his ships after such infidels; he was destitute of religion. Notwithstanding his kindness to the sick and his public benefactions, his character and nature were not adorned with the virtue of Christian charity, for it was said of him that "he never had a friend." He died on December 26, 1831, worth a fortune of \$9,000,000. Bequeathing little to his relatives, he gave by his will legacies amounting to about a million of dollars to benevolent and public purposes and works. But the chief feature of his testamentary disposition was the founding of Girard College, for which purpose he gave the bulk of his estate amounting to several millions, for the benefit of orphans.

Being himself an unbeliever in religion, he took the most radical measures in his will to exclude it from Girard College. While inculcating benevolence, love of truth, sobriety, industry, and morality, the means by which he had himself attained such signal

success in the temporal order, he positively prohibited any ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatever from holding any connection with the college; and he went so far as to prohibit all such from admittance to its premises, even as visitors.

While willing to concede—and the concession is a liberal one—that the establishment of Girard College was an act of philanthropy, we cannot regard it as a charity. We agree with the eloquent and noble sentiments of Daniel Webster, in his great argument in the celebrated Girard Will case, in which the great American jurist and advocate said to the court: "And I maintain that, in any institution for the instruction of youth, where the authority of God is disowned, and the duties of Christianity derided and despised, and its ministers shut out from all participation in its proceedings, there can no more be charity, true charity, found to exist, than evil can spring out of the Bible, error out of truth, or hatred and animosity come forth from the bosom of perfect love. No, sir! No, sir! If charity denies its birth and parentage, if it turns infidel to the great doctrines of the Christian religion, if it turns unbeliever, it is no charity. There is no longer charity, either in a Christian sense or in the sense of jurisprudence, for it separates itself from the fountain of its own creation."

The third motive we have mentioned for the establishment and maintenance of measures and institutions for the relief, care, protection, and reformation of the dependent and unfortunate classes of society, is the motive of public policy. This should be more appropriately called public duty. It is a motive or duty which applies to the public, to the state. And this duty is to be traced to the fundamental motives which lead men to form governments and to the duties thereby imposed upon all governments as inherent in their nature. And although these motives and duties may be predicated of all governments, whatever their forms or constitutions, we Americans may be pardoned for regarding the republic as the model form of government, and to draw our illustrations therefrom. Not only are the United States a republic, but they are bound by the Constitution to guarantee the republican form of government to every State in the Union. Hence, what we now say as to the objects and motives of government, as based upon the Federal Union, will equally apply to all the States. These objects are clearly defined by the Constitution, and they are the same substantially in every State constitution.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do or-

dain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I quote from the Constitution of the great State of Pennsylvania :

"We, the representatives of the freemen of Pennsylvania, in general convention met, for the express purpose of framing such a government, confessing the goodness of the great Governor of the universe (who alone knows to what degree of earthly happiness mankind may attain by perfecting the arts of government) in permitting the people of this State, by common consent, and without violence, deliberately to form for themselves such just rules as they shall think best for governing their future society ; and being fully convinced that it is our indispensable duty to establish such original principles of government as will best promote the general happiness of the people of this State and their posterity, and provide for future improvements, without partiality for or prejudice against any particular class, sect, or denomination of men whatever, do, by virtue of the authority vested in us by our constituents, ordain, declare, and establish the following *Declaration of Rights and Frame of Government* to be the Constitution of this Commonwealth."

It is therefore the duty of every State to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and to secure liberty for the present and future generations. While many duties and the powers necessary for discharging them spring from these fundamental objects of government, conspicuous among them is the police power of the State governments ; a power which many judicial decisions of the courts have regarded as not among the powers surrendered by the States to the federal or general government, but as a power retained by the States and by the people of the States. The police power and the police duty are correlative and coextensive. And it is under these powers and duties that we see erected and maintained the public prisons, almshouses, hospitals, houses of correction, asylums for widows and orphans and the insane, reformatories, protectories, and the splendid array of public institutions which are the just pride of our States and leading cities. In the older countries of Europe these provisions for the general welfare have produced solid and ample prosperity under the accumulated endowments of centuries. Even in American cities, which are of comparatively recent foundation, so keenly have the governmental authorities been alive to those duties which the establishment of justice, the insurance of domestic tranquility, providing for the common defence, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing of the blessings of liberty as the inheritance of the Ameri-

can people, require at their hands that they have just cause for pride in the public institutions which adorn their great and spacious streets, avenues, and boulevards. Side by side with those noble institutions which Christian charity and human philanthropy have erected, stand the municipal establishments that public policy has impelled the State to erect and conduct.

For how, it might be asked, could this glorious Union be preserved unless the criminal classes are restrained and segregated in public prisons and unless the youths of the country are educated in institutions devoted to the inculcation of the duties of good citizenship, of patriotism, of morality, and of religion? How could domestic tranquility be insured, the common defence provided for, the general welfare promoted, and liberty secured, if poverty is left unprovided for and thus subjected to the temptations of crime and vice; if the unfortunate insane are allowed to roam at large to their own destruction and a danger to the lives and property of the community; if the infirm and sick are allowed to perish in our streets and the victims of contagious disease to mingle with the general population of our large cities; if juvenile delinquency is left unrestrained and unreformed to develop into matured and incorrigible criminality?

It would be a noble exhibit, if time and space permitted us to give a detailed account of what are popularly called the public charities of some of our great American cities. And while we do not regard as public charities those provisions of the public authorities for the performance of those duties enjoined by the inherent objects and purposes for which governments are formed—since they are more properly to be regarded as but the discharge of public obligations—yet they challenge our admiration by their noble purposes, by their generosity, by their public spirit, by the good which they accomplish, by the sufferings they assuage, by the crimes which they prevent, and by the blessings of union, liberty, and good government which they promote. It would be in our power to present the statistics of the public institutions of a single State of our Union which expends annually in works of beneficence and relief, of education and philanthropy, of public charities and correction, the munificent sum of over \$20,000,000, the State of New York. But we find ourselves in the midst of problems to be solved; of great moral, religious, constitutional, and social problems, which greatly concern the interests of the country in the objects and purposes for which governments are founded, the future interests of the republic, and the happy realization of the promises of religion for eternity.

In the midst of all these splendid works and labors of beneficence and love there is an appeal that comes up to us from the

agonies of society's throes—a voice eloquent with suffering, pathetic in its woe, irresistible in sympathy and justice. It is the cry of the child, the voice of helplessness, the appeal of innocence or of nascent and irresponsible delinquency; as “the child is father of the man,” so this touching appeal is the voice of future citizenship, of which the child of the day is the archetype. The solution of social problems growing out of the status of adults is not so difficult, and yet the principles of the rights of conscience which we will discuss apply with almost equal force to all human beings held in custody or imprisonment under the varied methods in which the police power of governments may be administered or applied. Apart from those positive and affirmative powers and duties which aim at securing the blessings of good government under our republican governments, that other power, the negative, or preventive and corrective, the protective and reformatory power—the police power—is held, by judicial decisions, to extend to and embrace all matters necessary to protect the public health, the public morals and the public safety. Its very nature and necessities show how indefinite, how vast, how elastic, how unique and exceptional the police power of the State must be, and, consequently, how fearful, how dangerous, how mysterious, how like the inexorable hand of war! How necessary it is, then, above all things, while securing the safety of the State, to respect the natural and inalienable rights and liberties of the citizen! Protection and reformation are among the highest and deepest problems of the police power of the State. This power can only be exercised with performance of a duty—the duties of the State; and what duties of the state are more sacred than those which the State owes to the child? Hence the cry of the child reaches the heart of Christendom, arouses the best sentiments of humanity, gives energy and vitality to philanthropy, and arouses the most heroic love and self-sacrifice of charity. It calls forth the best exertion of the energies of the public policy of the State in the discharge of those duties which her organic law imposes upon her.

The problem of the child presents itself with the most embarrassing circumstances of numbers, means and methods in our large cities. So appalling is the task that the combined efforts of religion, philanthropy and public policy are unequal to a complete performance of it. We who have made a study of the child problem have estimated that there are now over twenty-two millions of children in the United States. Of these, at least one-half, or eleven millions, are in the larger cities. And of these eleven millions one-tenth at least, or one million one hundred thousand, are in such circumstances or environment as need the aid or intervention of



charity or philanthropy or public policy. In the single State of New York there are over thirty thousand children who under the classification of dependent, juvenile offenders, reformatory prisoners. With an array of public and private charities not equalled in any State in the Union, and not surpassed by those of any nation in the world, there were, in 1893, as many as eighty thousand five hundred and forty-three, to which we must add ten thousand inmates of prisons, penitentiaries and jails. In the increase of the last two years, and this will make the total number of persons who are a charge, in some form or other, upon that State amount to about one hundred thousand. A distinguished lawyer and friend of the child, Mr. Joseph H. C. Smith, said in the New York Constitutional Convention, of which he was president, in 1894: "Now, Mr. Lautenbach gave us a figure which is the starting-point, and a terrible figure it is. In the city of New York to-day, with eighteen hundred thousand people, there are eighteen thousand children dependent upon charity for support. For every hundred people in the city of New York there is one child dependent upon public charity—a most pitiable state of affairs. We have before us now, in preparing this paper, the official reports of other States and cities, and they show that while New York has more than its share, in consequence of its immense immigration, population and its tenement houses, there is a "pitiable state of affairs" that could be told of other States and cities. But a volume, or at least a single paper, could not suffice to tell the story. The statistics of other countries show similar statistics in this particular, and the struggle to meet this emergency, and to solve the problem, is confined to no nation, clime or hemisphere—it is universal.

The duty of the State in solving this momentous problem is a civil duty. To see that the dependent young are so trained and educated as to make good citizens is a brief and simple way of stating the duty of the state. The state is bound to see that proper care is taken to promote good health and robust constitutions, that they receive a proper education, that their morals are well guarded, and that religion, the most essential part of the education of the young, is the most important element in the life and character of a citizen, and of its citizens, should be fostered, protected and guaranteed.

We know, both from divine precepts and from experience, that religion is an essential part of education, that it is the most essential part, and that it is the foundation of all education. The consensus of all nations and peoples establish this principle. We need not quote, on this head, from the Old and New Testaments, or from the Bible to prove that religion is essential to all nations and peoples, especially for the young, and that there is no education

the proper sense of the word, without religion. The sages of every land and the expounders of every creed have maintained this great principle. In remote antiquity Confucius enjoined this duty upon the great Oriental peoples that followed his teachings. So, too, in the Ordinances of Menu, claiming an antiquity greater than the Books of Moses, there is scarcely one of its twelve books, or one of its twenty-five hundred sections, that does not inculcate religion as the first and best instruction. Zoroaster, the great teacher and legislator of the Persians, inculcated this principle throughout the Avesta, their most sacred of books, and the Hebrew Talmud, as is shown by either the Palestrianian or Babylonian compendium, places above all other requirements of education the precepts of religion. Mahomet, in the Koran, makes religion the beginning and the end of all things.

In Pagan Greece and Rome the sages upheld the pre-eminence of religion in education. Plato, the great expounder of Grecian civilization and polity, addressed these burning words of wisdom to the republics of every land and age and to our own: "Ignorance of the true God is the greatest pest of all republics; therefore whoever destroys religion destroys the foundation of all human society." And the polished orator and statesman of ancient Rome maintained that "It is necessary that the citizens should be first persuaded of the existence of the gods, the directors and rulers of all things, in whose hands are all events, who are ever conferring on mankind immense benefits, who search the heart of man, who see his actions, the spirit of piety which he carries into the practice of religion, and who distinguish the life of the pious man from that of the ungodly man." And Seneca, the great inculcator of morals, said: "The first thing is the worship of the gods and faith in their existence; we are next to acknowledge their majesty, and bounty, without which there is no majesty."

During the long period of the first sixteen centuries of the Christian era when, as under the government of God's chosen people, the form of government might be likened almost to a theocracy, religion was the pre-eminent element and the controlling force in education. It was from religion that the great universities of Europe sprang, and it was by religion that they were chiefly inspired and directed. But we propose to cite only non-Catholic authorities in support of this great principle.

Even after the "Reformation," when the convents and monasteries, those ancient and venerable seats of secular and religious education, were abolished by the statute of 1st Edward VI., chapter 14, the very funds raised by the confiscation and sale of the religious institutions of old were directed to be applied to the founding of grammar-schools, and the statute provides for the re-

ligious instruction of youth. In the case of the *Bedford Charity*, reported in 2d Swanston's Reports, at page 529, Lord Eldon, in his elaborate opinion, states that in those grammar-schools the utmost care was taken for the education of the pupils in the Christian religion.

And here let us ask what such authority could be more esteemed, venerated and followed than that of George Washington, the father of our country? In his farewell address, Washington addressed to every American citizen for all time the following language: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion; whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

The following additional passages from the great argument of Daniel Webster that ablest and most eloquent expounder of the American constitution and of true Americanism, will go far to sustain our contention that religion is an essential part of the education of the young. In the celebrated Girard will case, Mr. Webster, among other sublime words, said: "The ground taken is that religion is not necessary to morality; that benevolence may be inculcated by habit, and that all the virtues may flourish and be safely left to the chance of flourishing without touching the waters of the living spring of religious responsibility. With him who thinks thus what can be the value of the Christian revelation? So the Christian world has not thought; for by that Christian world, throughout its broadest extent, it has been, and is, held as a fundamental truth that religion is the only solid basis of morals, and that moral instruction not resting on this basis is only a building upon sand. And at what age of the Christian era have those who professed to teach the Christian religion, or to believe in its authority and importance, not insisted on the absolute necessity of inculcating its principles upon the minds of the young? In what age, by what sect, when, where, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of the young? Nowhere, never; everywhere, and at all times, it has been, and is, regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality, of useful instruction. . . . The earliest and the most urgent intellectual want of human nature is the knowledge of its origin, its duty and its destiny. 'Whence am I, what am I, and what is before me?' This is the cry of the human soul so soon as it raises its contemplation above visible, material things." In this great forensic effort Mr. Webster made an overpowering burst of eloquence on those beautiful words of our Saviour, "Suffer little children to come unto me."

Eminent among the countless opinions we now have at our pen, and which are too numerous to be quoted here, on the necessity of religion in education, is that of the distinguished philanthropist and Christian, Elbridge T. Gerry, the indefatigable president of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, of whom it has been well said that he "is an example of a very rich man who is not content with drawing his check for benevolent or charitable purposes, but who devotes himself to those subjects in New York; who can be found before any of us are up in the city of New York at the Tombs or elsewhere looking after poor people, whether delinquents or otherwise." Mr. Gerry said before the New York State Charities Aid Organization, in 1893: "An institution is the best place for a child who has not a home. There is nothing which will compensate for the loss of home under the natural home influences and surroundings—the influence of the family life, of the family circle and family religion. And where the child, from accident or from any fault of its parents, or from the nature of its surroundings, is deprived of this home influence, it is necessary that some place should be provided for it to prevent its growth in evil practices and eventually ending in vice; and very often the very best effects have resulted from placing such child in an institution. In the growth of children the first place should be given to religion, and that training should be on the lines of parental faith; second, proper education, without which you can hope for nothing in ensuing work."

Mr. Erastus Brooks, who in his lifetime was an uncompromising opponent of the Catholic Church, a distinguished member of the New York Constitutional Convention of 1867, the editor of the New York *Evening Express*, and the antagonist of Archbishop Hughes in a famous controversy on ecclesiastical properties in 1853, says: "The State ought not to support the churches, and it ought not to make donations for purely sectarian purposes. And having answered this question, let me add that it is also unworthy of a State to deny any class of needy people the State's aid because the recipient of its bounty, perchance, belongs to any sect or to no sect; and I may also add that is also unworthy of taxpayers and all others to incite the fury of the State against any sect or party on account of its religious faith. . . . Yet, while discarding State and Church as combinations, we must remember that there can be no true charity where all religion is excluded, since a pure charity is the very essence of practical Christianity, though no necessary part of what in the State is called 'a religious establishment.' Each member of a family, and every family, are a part of the State, whether rich or poor. The petitioners to this body seem to regard Roman Catholics solely in the light of

sectarians, and in this they err, just as the people in England erred when, in the reign of King Charles, they declared that dissent from the Catholic Church was sectarianism. Men may be Roman Catholics and something more. I lay it down as an axiom, sir, for which there is the highest authority, that to enforce human duties by divine obligation is not sectarian.

"I admit, sir, again and again, that sectarianism cannot be, must not be, supported by the State; nor must it, sir, if presented in the form of a true charity, be disowned by the State. Charity, which St. Paul makes the chief good, is scattered all over the Bible. It beams and shines there like the sun by day and the moon and stars by night. It is the very essence of the Christian religion, and therefore, in a civilized country cannot be excluded, in precept or practice, from any public or private institution. Again, sir, if you strike at one mode of religious worship, you strike at all. Your blows fall everywhere, and prostrate all whom they reach. You must not suppose that asylums in New York, West Chester, Rochester, or Buffalo, can be assailed upon the score of sectarianism, or Romanism, if you please, and Protestant institutions, like the two State houses of refuge, the institutions for the deaf and dumb, the blind, the children's aid societies, Five-points mission, hospitals for those of mature years, and infant dependence, escape unscathed. All are so far Protestant as to have Protestant officers, Protestant boards of trustees and directors, and a general Protestant management and superintendence.

"This is true, sir, of all our main institutions, either criminal or for the maintenance of the poor. I have no fault to find with any of them; but be careful where you strike, or, like Samson, you may bring the whole temple at your feet, and destroy all in your zeal to prostrate those you dislike.

"To say that the State has nothing to do with religion makes it atheistical; and that education and charity form no part of its duties, makes it barbarian. To declare, also, that all State duties look only to the protection of individual property, or what are called the rights of society, makes it but little more than material. The State takes life, limb, time, as well as property and money, to maintain its power and supremacy. It makes war, fires towns and ships, incarcerates in dungeons, abridges liberty, and punishes whom the law declares worthy of punishment, and often without discrimination of right. Can it do all this, and do nothing to minister to the souls and bodies of those who are diseased, infirm, naked, and hungry.

"And, first, of the nice distinction between charity in a State or legal sense, and in the sense in which it is a private benevolence. It is said that it is not right to tax the people for charity; but this

depends upon contingencies. If the charity is of a public nature, the tax paid for it is right. If partly public and partly private, the tax is right to the extent of the aid for public purposes."

From among the countless similar opinions before us, we will select that of a distinguished Hebrew advocate, Mr. Myer Stern, who ably supported the views of his confrere, Mr. Edward Lauterbach, in the New York Constitutional Convention in 1894, and said:

"Woe unto the day, gentlemen, that religion is interjected into our politics; and woe unto the men, who, in their pretended desire to separate Church and State, stir up the terrible fire of religious hatred. I believe in the most absolute separation of Church and State, and so do all patriotic Americans; but I believe, also, that the State has a duty to perform to the community by taking hold of the children who are penniless, or those who are worse than penniless. This duty, mind you, is not alone to these children, who must be led into the path of virtue and honor, but to the community, which must be protected against their becoming future charges upon the public, either as criminals or shiftless beings unfitted for the world.

"I do not suppose there is any difference of opinion on this question at all; if there is any, let those who entertain it think for a moment, what rich material there is for future criminals in the 18,000 children who are maintained in New York institutions to-day. Taken from the very dregs of society, they are brought into new environments, and under sweeter influences; but imagine what would have become of them otherwise?"

But, as we have quoted from pagan authorities of ancient Greece and Rome, we will conclude this branch of our subject with quotations from Thomas Henry Huxley, the naturalist, and Herbert Spencer, the evolutionist, who cannot be suspected of aiding the cause of Christianity, but were representatives of modern advanced thought, and who derided the idea that secular education alone was sufficient.

Mr. Huxley, in one of his "Lay Sermons," said: "I protest that, if I thought the alternative was a necessary one, I would rather the children of the poor should grow up ignorant of both these mighty arts—reading and writing—than that they should remain ignorant of that knowledge to which these arts are means."

Mr. Spencer, in his "Sociology," says: "Are not fraudulent bankrupts educated people—the getters-up of bubble companies, the makers of adulterated goods; the users of false trade-marks, and retailers who have light weights, and owners of unseaworthy ships, and those who cheat insurance companies, and those who carry on turf chicanery, and the great majority of gamblers? Or,

to take a more extreme form of turpitude, is there not among those who have committed murder by poison, a considerable number of the educated—a number bearing as large a ratio to the educated classes as does the total number of murderers to the total population? This belief in the moralizing effect of intellectual culture, flatly contradicted by facts, is absurd, *a priori*."

But there is another great principle, a fundamental legal truth, which claims the careful consideration, profound study and honest application of American statesmen in the solution of that important and inevitable problem of the child. It is a clear, settled and well defined principle of English and American law that the Christian religion forms a part of the common law of the land. Numerous judicial decisions, both in England and America, announce this important principle. Lord Hale, in 1 Vernon's Reports, page 293, said that to decry the Christian religion tended to destroy all religion, and decided that the Christian religion was part of the common law of the land. Dane's Abridgment, chapter 219, recognizes the Christian religion as a part of the common law. In the case of *King v. Wilson*, reported in 2 Strange's Reports, page 834, the judges regarded writing against religion as an offence at common law, and they refused to allow this question to be argued. The same principle of the common law was laid down in the case of *Evans v. The Chamberlain of London*, 2 Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, page 95; Taylor's case, in 2 Merivale's Reports, page 405; *The Attorney-General v. The Earl of Mansfield*, in 2 Russell's Reports, page 501; and in *The Attorney-General v. Cullun*, in 1 Young and Collyer's Reports, page 411. In this last case the syllabus of the decision is thus given by the reporter: "*The Courts of Equity in this country (England), will not sanction any system of education in which religion is not included.*"

Among American decisions to the same effect, the case of *Lindenmuller v. The People of the State of New York*, which is reported in 33 Barbour's Reports, page 561, is a leading one. In this case the Supreme Court of New York said: "It is not disputed that Christianity is a part of the common law of England, and in *Rex v. Woolston*, the Court of King's Bench would not suffer it to be debated, whether to write against Christianity in general was not an offence punishable in the temporal courts at common law. The common law, as it was enforced on the 20th day of April, 1777, subject to such alterations as have been made from time to time by the Legislature, and except such parts of it as are repugnant to the Constitution is, and ever has been, a part of the law of the State of New York." And the Court cited *Constitutions* of 1846, Article I., Section 17; of 1821, Article VII., Section 13; and of 1777, Section 25. The following passage from the elabor-



ate decision of the Court will be read with interest. "It would be strange that a people, Christian in doctrine and worship, many of whom, and whose forefathers had sought these shores for the privilege of worshiping God in simplicity and purity of faith, and who regarded religion as the basis of their civil liberty, and the foundation of their rights, should, in their zeal to secure to all the freedom of conscience which they valued so highly, solemnly repudiate and put beyond the pale of law the religion which was dear to them as life, and dethrone the God who they openly and devotedly professed to believe, had been their protector and guide as a people. Unless they were hypocrites, which will hardly be charged, they would not have dared, even if their conscience would have suffered them to do so. Religious tolerance is entirely consistent with a recognized religion. Christianity may be conceded to be the established religion to the qualified extent mentioned, while perfect civil and political equality, with freedom of conscience and religious preference are secured to individuals of every other creed and profession."

In the same State of New York, the same principle was held in the case of *People v. Ruggles*, reported in 8 Johnston's Reports, page 291, wherein Chief Justice Kent said: "That to revile the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of the right of religious opinion and free discussion secured by the Constitution, and that the Constitution does not secure the same regard to the religion of Mahomet, or of the Grand Llama, as to that of our Saviour, for the plain reason that *we are a Christian people*, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity." . . . And again the same distinguished judge said that the New York State Constitution "will be fully satisfied by a free and universal toleration, without any of the tests, disabilities or discriminations incident to a religious establishment. To construe it as breaking down the common law barriers against licentiousness, wanton and impious attacks upon Christianity itself, would be an enormous perversion of its meaning."

In the case of *Lindenmuller v. The People of New York*, the Court alluded to the fact that the people of the old thirteen States of the Union had exiled themselves from their mother country and founded their homes and their commonwealths on these shores for the express purpose of enjoying their religion; the case of Maryland is a signal example of this important historical fact. From the foundation of that colony the observance of the religious worship of Catholic Christianity, and the most perfect toleration and equality before the law went hand in hand together. In the April number of this REVIEW the present writer gave the celebrated Toleration Act of that colony, entitled "An Act Concerning Religion," which begins



with the recital, "Forasmuch as in a well-governed and Christian commonwealth matters concerning religion and the honor of our God, ought, in the first place, to be taken into serious consideration, and endeavored to be settled." The Act, which was enacted in 1649, then creates as offences against the law, and imposes punishments for uttering reproachful words against our Saviour or the Holy Trinity, or the Blessed Virgin Mary, or the Holy Apostles, the calling of others by such names as "Heretick, Schismatic, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antimormon, Barronist, Roundhead, Separatist," or other such term; for profaning the Sabbath, or for holding angry disputes on religion or creeds.

In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the case of *Updegraph v. Commonwealth*, reported in 11 *Sergent and Rawle's Reports*, page 394, and in the case of *Show v. The State of Alabama*, reported in 5 *England's Reports*, page 259, the Christian religion was recognized as a part of the Common Law. The important case of *Vidal v. Girard's Executors*, reported an appeal in 2 *Howard's U. S. Supreme Court Reports*, page 127, in the Supreme Court of the United States the question as to whether the Christian religion is a part of the Common Law was discussed, and that highest of American Courts held that it is. Judge Story, in delivering the opinion of the Court said: "So that we are compelled to admit, that although Christianity be a part of the Common Law of the State (of Pennsylvania), yet it is so in this qualified sense, that its divine origin and truth are admitted, and therefore, it is not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed against, to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public."

In every State of the Union religious liberty is secured in the several constitutions among the inalienable rights of the people, just as the same sacred right is imbedded in the Constitution of the United States. The language of the Constitution of Pennsylvania is as follows: "Section 3. All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

It has been pointed out in the course of this article that the Christian religion forms part of the Common Law. The American Constitutions, without exception, guarantee freedom of con-

science and absolute religious liberty to all. Does it not follow that all religious denominations thus safe-guarded in these fundamental bodies of laws are the joint protectors with the State, each of its own fellow-worshippers who are in need of that aid which public duty and private charity equally owe to helpless childhood, indigence, disease, vagrancy, vice and ignorance? Public policy and police regulation impose a duty on the State. Divine charity inflames the Christian heart to supplement the work of government with the alms-deeds of private benevolence. Of all the forms of human misery that of little children roaming the streets of great cities, ignorant, poverty-stricken and eddying with a current beyond their power to resist into the vortex of crime, is surely the most pitiable and appalling spectacle that menaces society to-day. "What is to become," exclaims Archbishop Ryan, "of the great number who have fallen away, in various degrees, from the paths of rectitude? These boys have much that is good left in them. They have the faith which can renew within their young hearts the first salutary impressions of their Christian homes. 'There is an angel imprisoned in that rough block of marble,' said Michael Angelo, 'and I shall liberate the angel,' and with his artistic chisel he brought out the imprisoned angel until it seemed as if prepared to join its celestial companions." With these vivid words the Most Reverend Archbishop makes his appeal for the new Catholic protectory for boys in Philadelphia. It is a grand idea, full of promise and fraught with incalculable blessings to the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania.

The drastic provisions of the State Constitution against State charities for denominational purposes would seem at first to admonish us in the outset that the scheme of a protectory, inception and realization, must be our own unaided, Catholic work. Thus the grand enterprise of Archbishop Hughes was launched on its auspicious voyage in New York which, as Burke said of the philanthropy of Howard, was to prove "a circumnavigation of charity." The lines are beaten out for Philadelphia in the history of its New York precursor, and are legible in every page of its thirty odd annual reports. The Constitution of Pennsylvania bids Catholics look to themselves alone, and with a cheerful alacrity let us set about the business in hand. Section 17 of that instrument reads as follows: "No appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth, other than normal schools established by law for the professional training of teachers for the public schools of the State, except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house." Section 18 is coached in the following language: "No appropriations, except for pensions or gratuities

for military services, shall be made for charitable, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person or community, nor to any denominational or sectarian institution, corporation, or association."

The prohibition is impartial. We have seen in Sec. 3 of the Pennsylvania State Constitution, already quoted, that "no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship." After enumerating the institutions established by unaided Catholic piety and benevolence, Archbishop Ryan with just pride recalls the fact to the Catholics of the diocese: "And all this you have done without one cent's appropriation from the State." A grander movement, a protectory all embracing in its charity to the "little children" of Christ, now impends, and the appeal for its establishment has been made.

If we seek for a model system for the performance of this noble duty, it is to be found directly at hand in the great New York institution. No feature of proselytism, as we have already asserted, is found in the New York Protectory. "Long will the scene be remembered," says the Fourth Annual Report of the latter institution, page 105, "in which, as our claim for an appropriation before a committee of the Legislature was bitterly assailed on sectarian grounds, an eminent Protestant lawyer arose and eloquently said, in reply: 'Gentlemen, I think I am speaking for the whole Bench of judges in the city of New York, while I affirm that if the existence of the institution under the Society for the Protection of Destitute Roman Catholic Children in that city has no other claim upon us, it certainly deserves our regard and support for *one blessing* it has achieved; and *that is*, the removal from our courts of the cause of incessant litigation between parents and proselyters as to the legal disposition of poor children.'"

As rigorous as seems the constitutional prohibition in Pennsylvania against denominational or sectarian appropriations, whether for charity or education, it is nevertheless allowed by law to the State authorities to put children under their control out at board, and the expense becomes a State charge for such subsistence. The board bills are paid by the public; and private benevolence here steps in, as in the case of the New York Catholic Protectory, and does the rest. By Act of the Pennsylvania Assembly of June 13, 1883, the Philadelphia Department of Charities and Correction is allowed so to board the children under its custody, and we find in ex-Mayor Stuart's Annual Message and accompanying documents for the year 1893, among the children so put out at boarding, forty-one were sent to Catholic institutions, and eighteen of the number remained in those institutions at the close of that year. Ex-Mayor Stuart adverts to a significant fact in this connection. "Your particular attention is called to the fact that throughout

the entire year in both Bureaus of this department (Charities and Correction), there was a greatly increased population receiving its care, there being an increase of one hundred and thirty-seven in the average daily population in the Bureau of Charities, and of seventy-six in the average daily population of the Bureau of Correction, yet there was a decrease in the daily *per capita* cost for subsistence in both bureaus" (page 23, Annual Message). Thus is made apparent the efficacy and economy of denominational work. The poor-house and work-house are no places for children. The civic duty which supplies them should become the enlarged statesmanship to supplement them by private institutions. Private charity does this work for the State far better, and, as ex-Mayor Stuart says, at a decreased cost. Investigation will show that there is nothing in the constitution and laws of Pennsylvania to prevent the State or the city from paying for services rendered to the public in the care of its waifs, which is nothing more than discharging the public duty in the most convenient and efficient manner. The model system of performing this public duty is that of the State of New York, where, by law, all children committed by magistrates must be committed to "institutions governed by persons of the same religious faith as the parents of such child." What is there to prevent the same being done in Pennsylvania? Mayor Stuart's report shows that it is practically being done now.

Here is a letter from one of the most experienced and practical philanthropists of our times, Mr. Elbridge T. Gerry, President of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, a gentleman who is not a Catholic, but one whose opinions are formed from the widest sphere of activity and knowledge in the management of helpless childhood. We commend it to the study of wise statesmen and law-makers as the voice of one of America's wisest philanthropists.

THE NEW YORK SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO  
CHILDREN.

NEW YORK, May 20, 1895.

RICHARD H. CLARKE, ESQ.

*My Dear Sir:* In reply to your letter of May 17th, I proceed to answer your inquiries as follows:

So far from having had any reason to change my opinion in relation to the New York Catholic Protectory from that expressed by me in my argument before the late Constitutional Convention, I avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm my belief that the policy of the people of this State requires that destitute children, so far as practicable, shall be trained and brought up in institutions conducted in the interests of the faith of their parents; and that this principle is not only a wise and salutary one, but absolutely essential to the future success of the child in life.

I regard religion as an essential part of the education of children. Unless a firm religious faith is instilled in the child at an early age, but little can be done to insure its proper growth in those lines of life which alone result in the formation of reputable

citizens and maintain the personnel of the people, who are the sovereigns of the nation. Deprive a child of religion, and you deprive it of every incentive and end. Leave a child simply to the inculcation of the ordinary tenets of science, soon its belief is overturned, its disposition becomes wayward and feeble, it does not grasp readily the very principles sought to be instilled into it, it pays little attention to the past, is absorbed by the present, and cares nothing for the future. Without religion, the child is in the same condition in which it would be if placed in a boat, understanding nothing of the principles of navigation, without any guide it or any knowledge of its course. Shipwreck, sooner or later, is the inevitable result.

In my judgment it would be a most unwise thing for the State, under any circumstances, to deprive the denominational institutions of the care of destitute children, and especially of those children who, having been exposed to the contagion of vice, are suffering mentally and morally from the effects of that poison. Only the influences of religious teaching can eradicate the seeds of moral disease, and only long-continued training of the child can eviscerate the poison when it is once admitted in the moral system. Unhappily, at times, this seems to be impossible, and yet sometimes encouraging results are accomplished even with the most depraved and abandoned. To question this, is to doubt the goodness of God. To maintain it, involves the holding of the institutions. Facts always speak louder than words, and the success of child-saving work fully sustain my position in this respect.

Lastly, in reference to the Catholic Protectory, I know of no institution more thoroughly, economically, and faithfully conducted than the one in question. Its management is admirable. The child is not only trained in the principles of religion, but is enabled to earn its own living when it leaves the institution. The physical condition of the child is carefully cared for, the food and clothing are excellent, and, in my opinion, if the New York Catholic Protectory were duplicated in every city of the United States, a bulwark would thereby be established in favor of Catholic children, to shield them from the results oftentimes of the folly and crimes of others, from the consequences of which they would otherwise inevitably suffer. The secret of the success of the protectory is the magnificent system on which it is founded. The trouble with sectarian institutions is, that there is no unity of purpose, and the result is a disjointed and incohesive system, sometimes producing beneficial results, but too often failing to produce any result at all, or a defect alluded to.

I have the honor to remain,

With great respect,

ELBRIDGE T. GERRY,  
*President*

Of all the handmaids of the State for snatching brands from the fire, and preventing burning, the New York Catholic Protectory may be singled out as the chiefest and best. Public or State charities are an imperative duty of government. They are too often confounded by bigotry with private benevolence and withheld under a false cry of security from attacks upon the State treasury. Public policy not only requires, but public duty requires that poverty and vice, and ignorance among the young should be arrested, and the fundamental principles of reading and writing and of morality and religion should be inculcated as the mainstays of society against anarchy, and the primary duty of the American people as the safeguard of the Republic. Millions are spent to support criminals in prisons. Would not more money be better spent to prevent crime, and make the criminals good citizens? The charity is often mixed, partly private

partly public. Wherever this is the case private institutions like the New York Catholic Protectory and the proposed Philadelphia Catholic Protectory, can do the work for the city and State more cheaply, more effectively, far better than public institutions. Such is the uniform experience wherever the two systems have come into competition. Never was this more perfectly shown than by Mr. George Bliss, of New York, in his argument before the committees of the Constitutional Convention of that State held last year. His thesis in part, was this: "The State hires societies to board and educate those whom it is itself bound to support somewhere, and pays to these societies and institutions less by nearly half than it could do the same work for in its own institutions, and less by a considerable sum than it costs those institutions in which that work is done, while the State gets them better cared for." And he proved it by an array of convincing arguments and figures.

The Hon. Henry Martyn Hoyt, the patriotic governor of Pennsylvania from 1878 to 1883, in one of his annual messages used burning words to convince the people that private benevolent institutions are better places for the juvenile waifs of the State than any public institutions can be. He said:

"From the State Board of Public Charities, from the official declarations made in the State Convention of Poor Directors, and from the testimony of interested citizens on all sides, comes a swelling protest against the longer continuance of the evil and disgrace attending the presence of children in our almshouses and poor-houses. In the past five years over three thousand children, under sixteen years' old, have been temporary or permanent residents of these institutions. These children, in a word, are enervated by idleness, corrupted in body and soul, without the possibility of acquiring or recovering their self respect, prepared for pauperism and crime, effectually wrecked at the outset of life. It would be gratifying if we had throughout the State more corporations of benevolent persons addressing themselves to this evil."

The other day appeared in the press a letter of Herbert Spencer expressive of the utmost irritation at a statement that certain European socialists and free-thinkers derived comfort for socialism from his writings. He regarded socialism, said the account, as the greatest curse of the century. If there be one duty more imperative than another, which public men in the United States owe to the people to-day, it is the duty to stem the rising tide of irreligion, at least by negative and co-operative action in conjunction with the various denominations of religious belief. The pagan element which has crept into the life of modern society, poisoning its literature, subverting or retarding the growth of Christianity and sub-

stituting the models of a godless philosophy for the wholesome lessons of the Gospel, must be eradicated, if the State is to be saved and our free institutions are to be preserved. Where is the point of vital attack, where that of defence, if it be not in the ranks of our children and in the proper treatment of the child problem in America? Let Church and State remain apart, moving forward in their great work in parallel lines, never converging, each bearing its own standards, and each willing and ready to allow the other to do its share of the mighty work, in bringing up the millions of a rising generation in the paths of rectitude, good citizenship, self-dependence and Christian morality. Thus and thus only may the Republic which Washington bequeathed to us be saved to the human race. Thus may the child problem be solved. Denominational institutions, each for the children of its own faith, are the only agencies fit to grapple with the difficulties that beset the problem, able to supplement mere civics with that heavenly spirit which spoke as we have it, through the lips of the Redeemer.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

---



## Scientific Chronicle.

---

### PRECIOUS STONES—GEMS—JEWELS.

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,  
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;  
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,  
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."—GRAY'S *Elegy*.

THE poet may possibly have known what he was chanting about, but had he not taken the trouble to proclaim the fact, we should certainly never have thought it possible to gather any large crop of flowers from the desert. Had he, besides, not spoken so very positively about it, we should also have remained in profound ignorance concerning the contents of the *dark*, and especially of the *unfathomed*, caves of the ocean. Yet we are grateful for the information, even at the hands of a poet. And nevertheless, the flowers that bloom in the desert, or anywhere else for that matter, have nothing to do with the article now in hand; but the gems "of purest ray serene," or otherwise, are the very subject-matter with which we intend to deal to-day. With this lucid preface we plunge immediately into business.

#### PRECIOUS STONES.

A "precious stone" is a mineral possessing the qualities of hardness, durability, and beauty of color, in such a degree as to render it suitable as an article of ornamentation. Strictly speaking, this concerns the material in itself, but the appreciation in which a stone may be held will depend, to a great extent, on its rarity also.

Under the broad definition just given would be included, besides what are usually considered as precious stones, the more ornamental kinds of building stones, as well as those that are used for statuary, such as the finer granites, marbles, serpentines, etc. In a more restricted sense, and the one in which we use it here, the definition includes only such minerals as are used for personal decoration, as in rings, charms, brooches, and the like, or for the ornamentation, and sometimes even manufacture, of articles for personal use, such as vases, cups, chalices, swords, pistols, candlesticks, etc. Judged by the standards of hardness, durability, beauty of color, and adaptability to personal ornamentation, the only really precious stones are the diamond, the ruby, the sapphire, and the emerald.

But there is a large family of minerals, almost perfectly durable, and fairly beautiful, which, though not so hard as the ones just named, are yet hard enough to scratch the hardest glass; for example, opal, turquoise, tourmaline, garnet, hyacinth, and others. These are classed as



"semi-precious," though in the appreciation in which they have at times been held, another law comes into play which has often raised one or other of them almost to the rank of the diamond itself. This is the law of the "fad." We shall meet with instances of the operation of this law later on.

#### GEMS.

A "gem" is a precious, or semi-precious, stone which has been cut and polished for ornamental purposes. The cutting may have been done merely with the object of getting rid of defective parts, and of producing such angles and surfaces as will best reflect and refract the light which falls upon the stone, as will be explained more fully further on. On the other hand, the cutting may be a true engraving, in which letters, and artistic, or what are intended to be artistic, figures are produced. If the engraved portion is in relief (standing out), the gem is called a *cameo*; if the engraving is sunken into the stone, it is called an *intaglio*. Cameos are employed as ornaments only, but intaglios are generally intended to be used as seals, and hence in them, all lettering must be reversed. In the days when kings spent most of their time in the noble art of fighting, and had little or none left to waste on such minor matters as learning to write, an intaglio, bearing the sovereign's name or initials, or coat-of-arms, or other figure chosen according to some whim or fancy, was set in a finger-ring. By means of it he stamped his signature, or what served as such, in wax, on any document that needed his authority, from the deed of sale of a goose and gander to the order to behead an innocent fellow-man. This was the monarch's signet-ring.

#### JEWELS.

A "jewel," properly speaking, is a precious stone, cut, polished, and set in its mounting, or, more briefly, a mounted gem. The name is however sometimes, though very improperly, applied to ornaments of gold, silver, or other metals. With these we have nothing to do, at least at present. Like every other decent word it is also frequently used in one or more metaphorical senses, but we must draw the line here.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF PRECIOUS STONES.

In order to make matters clearer, and at the same time to avoid tedious repetitions, we give here the chief distinguishing characters of the precious stones.

I. *Hardness*.—In common language this term is often used as synonymous with strength, or "difficulty of breakage." This is not its true meaning however, either in mineralogy or morals. It really means the resistance a body offers to being scratched. A substance which can be made to scratch another is said to be the harder of the two. Thus, a crystal of quartz will scratch steel, and is therefore harder than steel, though it is not nearly so strong, and can be broken much more easily. For the purpose of comparing the hardness of different minerals, the German chemist, Mohs, chose the following substances as standards in

constructing his "scale of hardness." The list is arranged in such a way that each mineral in it may be scratched by any one below it, and will scratch any one above itself.

1. Talc or Soapstone. (It is easily scratched by the thumb-nail.)
2. Compact Gypsum, or, Rock Salt. (About equally hard.)
3. Calcsp. (Any cleavable variety.)
4. Fluor Spar.
5. Apatite. (A compound of Calcium phosphate and fluoride.)
6. Feldspar. (Any cleavable variety.)
7. Quartz. (The limpid kind.)
8. Topaz.
9. Sapphire, or Corundum.
10. Diamond. (The hardest of all known substances.)

To estimate the hardness of a mineral, try it by the minerals of this list. For example, if a substance neither scratches nor is scratched by Quartz, we call its hardness 7. If it scratches Quartz and is scratched by Topaz, we say its hardness is 7.5, and similarly in other cases. Scratching and cutting are altogether different things, for though many minerals will scratch glass, only the natural edge of the diamond will cut it.

"In direct proportion to the hardness of a mineral is its susceptibility of receiving and retaining a good polish, which is the principal cause of the superior brilliancy and beauty of jewels over all other natural ornaments worn as decorations," says Harry Emanuel, in his "Diamonds and Precious Stones." This quality of hardness also it is that preserves gems from the ravages of time. Nineveh and Babylon have crumbled into dust, and the pyramids of Egypt are slowly but surely wasting away, but the gems unearthed to-day are as fresh and perfect as they were when they were first formed, and dropped like stars from the hand of the Creator, ages ere Nineveh was dreamt of, and while Babylon was yet unborn.

II. *Lustre*.—By this term is meant the peculiar brilliancy which the polished gem possesses. It depends, probably, upon the molecular structure of the stone, but is mainly a surface phenomenon. The different kinds of lustre have been classified as follows:

Adamantine: possessing the brilliancy of the diamond.

Vitreous: resembling the surface of polished glass.

Resinous: shining, like the freshly-exposed surface of resin.

Pearly: having the semi-iridescent appearance of pearl.

Silky: said of gems whose surface has, to a greater or less extent, the sheen of silk.

Metallic: most metals in the massive state, especially if polished, have, irrespective of their color, a lustre quite peculiar, and which is shared by many metallic compounds; but these are rarely used as gems.

Some other terms are occasionally employed, but these are the principal ones, and, after all, no description can really describe the lustre of a mineral, just as no one could make a blind man understand what is meant by "red," for example, or "green." Nothing but the normal

eyesight can give a correct idea of what is meant by lustre, and even then words fail to reproduce it, and the foregoing designations can only claim to be approximations.

III. *Color*.—The color of a gem plays a large part in the estimation of its beauty, but it affords no indication whatever of its nature or genuineness. The Ruby, the Spinnelle, and the Garnet are quite different chemically, and yet they are not unfrequently found of exactly the same color, and even of the same tint. On the other hand, the same mineral substance may have now one color now another, and indeed its name in commerce often depends upon what that color happens to be. Thus crystallized oxide of Aluminum ( $Al_2O_3$ ), when blue, is called Sapphire; when red, Ruby; and when yellow, Oriental Topaz; while Quartz takes on at least a dozen different names according to the color or tint of its crystals. These differences are usually ascribed to minute traces of metallic oxides in solution in the gems. Besides this, different parts of one and the same crystal may have different colors, as happens sometimes in the Oriental Sapphire, in which red, blue, and yellow, lie peacefully side by side. In some cases the color of a gem appears different according as you view it by reflected or by transmitted light, that is, according as you look *at* it, or look *through* it. Opal and Tourmaline afford instances of this phenomenon. It is also necessary to note that, in describing gems, the word "white" is often used where "colorless" is meant. It is an abuse that ought to be corrected, because it leads to confusion. If you say that pure water is "white," how are you going to designate the color of milk? And yet even a baby knows that they are not the same. Consistency is a jewel that ought to adorn the language of every one who speaks of gems.

IV. *Diaphaneity*.—We are obliged to use this cumbrous extract of Greek in this place because the handier Latin terms are needed just below. Most gems allow more or less light to pass through them, and "diaphaneity" is the word we employ to express that property. Its various degrees are the following:

Transparent: a term applied to a body through which objects can be distinctly seen.

Semi-transparent: when objects seen through it appear indistinct.

Translucent: when light indeed passes through, but objects cannot be distinguished.

Semi-translucent: when translucent at its edges only.

Opaque: when no light passes through.

The transitions are not however abrupt. The different conditions shade into each other by imperceptible degrees just as light and the day fade away gently into darkness and night, and just as gradually return at morning's dawn.

V. *Specific gravity*.—By this we mean the ratio which exists between the weight of a given substance and the weight of an equal volume of another substance arbitrarily chosen as the term or standard of comparison. As however this is rather too philosophical to be clear, let us try to clarify it a little by a concrete example. Suppose a given bulk of a substance, say gold,

weighs 242 grains, and that an equal bulk of distilled water at 32 degrees Fahrenheit weighs  $12\frac{1}{2}$  grains. Then the relation between these weights will be as 242 to  $12\frac{1}{2}$ , or, by reducing, as 19.36 to 1. That 19.36 is called the specific gravity of gold. The specific gravity of gems is very much lower than this, ranging as it does from less than 2, to about 5 as a maximum. In some cases the specific gravity is a perfectly decisive test of the genuineness of a gem when most other characteristics would leave us in doubt; as, for example, to judge between the white sapphire and the diamond, the former always having the higher specific gravity. However, to determine the specific gravity of a substance as closely as needed for test-work, requires a delicate balance and the delicate hand of a chemist to manipulate it. Needless to say that a pair of hay-scales, with a ploughman behind them, would hardly be found to suit the purpose.

*VI. Refraction and Dispersion.*—An important property of all transparent substances, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, is the power of refracting light. The meaning of this is that a ray of light on entering one of these substances in an oblique direction, instead of keeping straight on, is turned abruptly aside from its path. Its original line of direction has been *broken*, and hence the phenomenon is called *refraction*. If the ray emerges from the other side, and that side is in the proper position with respect to the first, the light, on passing out, will be still further turned aside from its original direction. The *total* amount of deviation depends, first, on the angle at which the light strikes the surface of the refracting substance, or medium as it is technically called; secondly, on the angle between the surfaces of entrance and emergence; and thirdly, on the nature of the medium itself. The *relative* refractive power depends solely on the nature of the medium, and is determined by what is called the “Index of Refraction.” We cannot here enter into a detailed explanation of this point, but shall content ourselves, and we hope our readers likewise, by giving the bald definition: “The Index of Refraction is the ratio between the sine of the angle of incidence, and the sine of the angle of refraction.” In any medium, a greater index of refraction means a greater refractive power.

Dispersion is a phenomenon which nearly always accompanies refraction. It consists in this, that when a ray of light is refracted, it is at the same time split up into its constituent colors, for, be it understood, color is light and nothing else. When white light, which is made up of all colors, suffers refraction in passing through a colorless medium, it is decomposed into its constituents, and hence gives us all of the simple or primary colors. An example of this may be seen in the bright bits of color produced by the glass pendants of the old-fashioned chandeliers of our grandmothers' days. How we used to revel in their beauty, as they dangled in the breeze, and sparkled in the glorious sunlight of those distant days! If however the light which falls upon the medium be monochromatic (one-colored), it cannot of course be decomposed, but this case will hardly occur in practice, for we generally

inspect our gems in the white sunlight, or at least in some artificial light which has some pretension to whiteness. Lastly, if the medium itself be colored, then only that color will pass through, and there will be refraction without decomposition, but there will be dispersion in the secondary sense that the colored ray will be somewhat broadened out. Thus, a piece of clear glass, or limpid rock crystal, of the proper shape, that of a triangular prism being the best, will decompose white light into its component colors, and let them pass through, but a colored prism will absorb and extinguish within itself every color except its own, and consequently only that will pass through.

The dispersive power is measured in this way. The angle between the least refracted and the most refracted color (the red and the violet), is called the *angle of dispersion*, and this angle, divided by mean angle of refraction of all the rays, gives the *dispersive power*. In the Table given below will be found the Refractive Index, and the Dispersive Power of the various gems.

VII. *Reflection* (internal).—The ordinary phenomenon of reflection is well known to everybody. It means that when light strikes a polished surface, a part at least of it is thrown back in such a way that the angle at which it glances off is the same as that under which it reached the polished surface. There is however one little point here that is not so well known, but which is of importance for the matter now in hand. We shall try to make it clear by an example. Suppose we had a mass of water perfectly clear and colorless, say the full of a cubical tank measuring ten feet each way. If now we hold an incandescent electric-light above the surface of the water, part of the light impinging on the surface of the water will be reflected from that surface, and the rest will penetrate the water and illuminate the sides and bottom of the tank. So far all is clear. But now let us lower the light deep into the water itself. Then, considering the light as the apex of an inverted cone whose base is at the surface of the water, and whose angle is 82 degrees and 50 minutes, all the light included within that cone will be separated into two parts, one of which will pass through the water, and out, while all the rest will be reflected back *internally*, to the bottom and sides of the tank. Of the light which strikes the surface outside of the base of the cone, no part will pass out, but it will all be reflected back into the tank. These internal reflections will therefore be either partial or total according to the angle at which the light reaches the surface from the inside. Such being the case, we are prepared to proceed to the next characteristic of gems, viz.:

VIII. *Fire*.—In order to become acquainted with the real significance of this word, we must beg, borrow, or get a gem; the best for the purpose would be perhaps a diamond, and all the better if it be colorless. It should have been properly cut. Now hold it up to the light. In striking the facets of the gem at different angles, part of the light will be refracted in one direction, and other parts in others. Moreover the different rays will be decomposed more or less completely into their primary colors; these will cross each other at different points, and then

partly pass on and through the crystal, and partly return by *internal* reflections, and crossing as before, will make the gem sparkle as "a thing of beauty and a joy forever." All this is due to refraction, dispersion, and reflection, and produces what is known as the "fire" of the gem. It is not the same as "lustre," though some careless writers have failed to note the distinction. It is plain that for the best effects the gem must be of the proper form, for even the diamond, if left rough, or if cut improperly, will have very little fire, while if cut just right, it surpasses in beauty every other known gem.

#### CUTTING.

In speaking of gems the word "cutting" is used in three different senses, viz.:

1. Cutting, technically so-called.
2. Splitting.
3. Sawing.

We have here in mind especially the case of the diamond, but whatever operations may be performed on the diamond can with yet greater facility be performed on other gems.

1. *Cutting*.—This means the abrasion or grinding down to the required surface rather than a true cutting in the ordinary sense of the word. It has frequently been stated that the art of cutting the diamond with its own powder, was discovered by Lewis Van Berghen, a Dutchman, in 1476, but Harry Emanuel mildly qualifies the statement as "somewhat inaccurate," since he finds instances of several diamonds that must, in his opinion, have been cut a hundred years earlier at least.

The instruments employed have varied considerably in the course of time, and vary also according to the nature of the gem to be cut. The process by which a piece of garnet may be fashioned might be wholly useless in the case of a ruby or diamond. To cut a diamond you must first get the diamond, or rather, you must get two of them. Then take two sticks, and, with jeweler's cement, fasten each gem into the end of a stick. Now take the sticks, one in each hand, and bring the exposed surfaces into contact. Then rub, and rub, and keep on rubbing, and don't give up, until those two surfaces are worn down flat and even. The flat surfaces so formed are called "facets." Next melt the cement, take out the diamonds, set them in again at exactly the right angle, and rub again as before; repeat the operation until you have formed the required number of facets, or rather the number that can be safely made by this first hand-process. Two or three times as many will be formed in the subsequent operation of polishing, of which more anon.

2. *Splitting*.—When, in order to bring the diamond to the required shape, a considerable portion has to be removed, recourse may be had to "splitting." This will save time and labor, and besides, "usable" pieces will sometimes be split off. To succeed in this operation however, you must have a thorough knowledge of the internal structure of the gem. You may have logic enough to argue a bull-terrier out of a

bone, but all your logic will fail ignominiously if you attempt to split a diamond "against the grain." Making however the rather wild supposition that you know just how the cleavage planes run, then, you may try your hand at splitting, but please, let us implore you, don't use a hatchet. Take the diamond and cement it strongly and deep in the end of a stout stick, leaving exposed that portion only which you intend to remove. Now with the natural edge of another diamond, make a scratch all around the base of this portion. But, to the critical mind, a doubt may arise here. If you can scratch one diamond with another, then which is the harder? Or, what becomes of the definition of "hardness?" But we need not be alarmed, for the natural edge of the diamond is slightly harder than the faces. Next deepen the scratch just made, as much as possible, with a fine splinter obtained from another diamond. Fix the cement-stick in a vise, insert the edge of a very hard, steel, knife in the scratch, and give it a smart blow on the back with a hammer. If the blow has been just right, and like a perfect beef-steak, neither overdone nor underdone, you will have made a clear split, saved a fragment of your diamond, and spared yourself a good deal of time and labor. But the chances are about even that you will botch it, and then you will lose both your labor and your pains, and probably spoil your diamond besides. In that case the only consolation we can offer you is: "Ah! We told you so," and then we feel taller by about three inches.

3. *Sawing*.—Diamonds may also be cut by sawing, but a buck-saw has not been found the most suitable tool for the purpose. If a fine iron wire be stretched in a hack-saw frame, and kept anointed with a paste of diamond powder and olive oil, and a very large dose of patience, one may work his way through the stone. This is a much safer process than splitting, and we recommend it to our readers.

#### FORMS OF GEMS.

The forms, or "cuts," given to gems are quite numerous. The best form to be given depends on the size, and shape, and perfection of the original crystal. Some of the names are: the Brilliant, the Brillionet, the Rose, the Table, the Pavilion, the Cabochon; there are even several varieties of each, but without diagrams it is totally impossible to give any idea of the meaning of these terms. Fortunately it is hardly necessary, as we take it for granted that most of our readers are perfectly familiar with the gems themselves. During the reign of Louis XIII. (1610-1643), Cardinal Mazarin first had diamonds cut in the form of brilliants, twelve of which were set in the crown of France, but several of them have since passed into the category of "lost, strayed, or . . . disappeared."

#### POLISHING.

The polishing of the diamond is done by means of a rapidly-rotating steel, or cast-iron, disk, called the "skaif." In order to hold the polishing powder of diamond-dust and olive oil, the skaif is grooved with fine lines in the direction of its radii. In primitive times, the skaif

was made to rotate by hand-power, and in India they do not seem to have got beyond this crude method even yet ; but horse, steam or electrical power is employed by most civilized lapidaries of the present day. In any case, the diamond, cemented to its stick, is pressed against the face of the anointed, rotating disk, and its position changed from time to time, till the form is correct and the polish perfect. It sometimes takes two or three years to finish up a single large gem. This operation of polishing may all seem simple enough, and probably it is so when there is question of the larger specimens, but when you come to the little ones, of which it sometimes takes more than 100,000 to weigh an ounce, it will be readily understood that very great skill and excellent eyesight are necessary.

#### ENGRAVING.

The art of engraving on gems in general, was known from the very earliest times. As we shall see later, frequent mention is made of them in the Bible, and specimens that have come down to us from ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, and the "gorgeous East," are often of the most exquisite art and workmanship, unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, by anything of more recent dates. C. W. King, in his magnificent work on "Antique Gems," says that the diamond furnishes no engravings of either ancient or modern artists. Yet, in another part of the same work, he accepts as a fact that Clemente Birago, a Milanese, in 1564, engraved on the diamond a portrait of Don Carlos, and also a seal of the Arms of Spain, and that Giovanni Costanzi, in 1750, at Rome, engraved in like manner a head of Nero for Vaini, while Carlo Costanzi succeeded in producing a Leda, and a head of Antinous for the king of Portugal. The two statements seem to be contradictory, but King probably means that these specimens are the only ones on record, and that even they are not now to be found. Others hold that these were only white sapphires.

The cutting, polishing, and engraving of gems, other than the diamond, offers comparatively little difficulty. It is accomplished by means of rotating disks, drills, and saws of steel or bronze, frequently almost microscopic in size, and armed when necessary with scraps of the diamond. Sometimes the work is done, at least in part, by means of diamond points set in handles, much after the manner in which our wood-engravers employ their tools of steel.

#### SETTING.

In order to preserve and properly display a gem, it requires to be mounted. In the East, especially in ancient days, and among the American Indians even later, gems were bored and assembled on a string. In our days, at least among civilized folks, a casing of gold, or silver, or bronze is used. For colorless gems, silver gives the best effect, for colored gems, gold is preferred. In the case of perfectly transparent gems, the mounting should clasp the stone at the edges only, so that it may be viewed by transmitted as well as by reflected



light. But when the gem is merely translucent, the back of the setting is closed, and is usually lined with foil of gold or silver, or else is colored to match the tint of the stone itself. This adds much to the brilliancy, and sometimes helps to disguise flaws and other imperfections, and hence a gem so mounted should never be bought till it has been taken out and carefully inspected. The beauty of a large stone may be much enhanced by surrounding it with smaller ones of different colors, but this does not yet come up to the brilliant idea of the lady who wanted to out rival all her rivals by having several "solitaires" set in the same mounting.

#### WEIGHT OF GEMS.

This is usually given in "carats." The carat is a red bean, the fruit of the "kuara," the so-called coral tree, and was formerly used for weighing gold dust. There is some discrepancy between the statements of different authors as to its true value. Feuchtwanger says it is equal to 4 grains, and that 44 carats are equal to one ounce. When a boy we imagined we knew some arithmetic, but in our old age we are obliged sorrowfully to confess that the latter half of the above statement has proved entirely too deep for us. The ounce Troy, and Troy-weight alone is used for gems, is 480 grains, but we have so far been unable to get 480 out of 4 times 44. We have tried the Rule of Three, and also Alligation, but they don't seem to work; some of the common arguments of Political Economy, however, come pretty near it. Another value given for the carat is 3.2 grains, but, according to G. F. Kuntz, the present international carat is 205 milligrams, or 3.168 grains nearly. The consequence of this tinkering with things once already tacitly agreed on, is that now when we read of a gem whose weight is given as, say 231 carats, we know as much about it as a hen does about the internal tonal possibilities of a fiddle-string.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF GEMS.

The ancients classified gems according to their colors; mineralogists nowadays arrange them according to their chemical composition; lapidaries look rather to their physical properties; others again write them down simply in alphabetical order. For our purpose the most satisfactory way probably is to arrange them in the order of their hardness, and then sub-classify according to color. This is the order of the following list which contains the principal precious stones. If carefully examined it will be found to contain a good deal of condensed information that may obviate the necessity of a large amount of dilute talk afterwards. In this Table the word "white" is used, out of deference to the masters in this branch, instead of the word "colorless."

#### THE INDIVIDUAL GEMS.

*Diamond.* —The name "diamond" is derived from the Greek word *adamas*, which means "invincible," and refers to the hardness of the stone. The Syrians are said to have been the first to know the diamond,

and in the early ages it was an article of commerce throughout all the East. The Etrurians procured diamonds in the interior of Africa, and sold them to the inhabitants of Carthage. Pliny mentions six species of what he calls diamonds, but later researches have proved that only the one from India was true, the others being merely quartz. The diamond, though worn in those times in the rough state, was highly prized, but rather on account of medicinal properties superstitiously attributed to it, than for its beauty.

Concerning the origin and nature of the gem, as well as of other precious stones, many wild ideas formerly prevailed. "Plato supposes that they are produced by the vivifying spirit abiding in the stars, which longing to form new things, converts the most vile and putrid matter into the most perfect objects. He describes the diamond as being found like a kernel in the gold, and supposes it to be the purest and noblest part, which had become condensed into a transparent mass." Theophrastus, the friend and disciple of Aristotle, speaks of the common belief of his time that some precious stones have the power of generating others, but he has sense enough to reject the fable. Pliny seems to reject it also, although it was firmly believed by his all-powerful patron, the Consul Mucianus. In later times it crops up again, for we find Ruæus relating that a lady of Heveren possessed two diamonds which *were seen* to bring forth others at certain fixed intervals. In India the belief is current to the present day, among the common people, that when a diamond mine has been exhausted, it will after the lapse of about twenty years be found as rich as ever in newly-grown precious stones. Still the splendors of old Golconda seem to be very slow in reviving.

The question of the composition of the diamond has been definitively settled only within the last hundred years, and we now know for certain that it is pure crystallized Carbon; but the mode of its formation is as profound a mystery to us as it was to the boys and girls who learned their letters from Cadmus. Of course there has all along been a good deal of speculating about it. Some have ascribed its formation to igneous action, by which the carbon was once melted; on cooling down, it naturally crystallized. A strong objection to this theory is that in the case of colored diamonds, and they are by far the more numerous, the coloring matter is in all probability an organic substance, and one which consequently could not stand the heat of fusion. Others have therefore supposed that just as we have plants to-day (the bamboo for example), which have the power of assimilating silex from the earth, and transforming it into the form of crystals of quartz, so there may have been in primitive times some plant, now extinct, which could not only assimilate carbon, as all plants indeed always do, but even crystallizes a part of it in the form of diamonds. Yet there is no certainty of this, and the conditions under which they are found do not seem to favor the theory. The final summing up is: "Nobody knows."

*Where Found.*—India was once the home of the diamond. It has moved its "Lares and Penates" several times since it was first discovered. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries as many as 60,000 persons,

Name and Color.	Hardness.	Lustre.	Diaphaneity.
DIAMOND. White, pink, yellow, red, blue, green, black, brown, orange, opalescent. BORT. CARBONATE (compact variety).	10	Adamantine with prismatic colors.  None.	Transparent. Translucent. Carbonate is opaque.
SAPPHIRE White, blue, violet. RUBY. Pink, red, violet-red. TOPAZ (oriental). Yellow. AMETHYST (oriental). Purple, violet. EMERALD (oriental). Green, generally pale.	9	Vitreous; very lively.	Transparent.
CHRYSOBERYL or ORIENTAL CHRYSOLITE. Bright pale-green, greenish-yellow, reddish-brown. ALEXANDRITE, when showing a reddish, translucent light. CYMOPHANE or CHRYSOBERYL CAT'S EYE, when opalescent.	8.5	Vitreous; sometimes pearly.	Transparent and semi-transparent.
SPINELLE. Dark-red, white, blue, green PLEONASTE or CEYLANITE. Black. RUBICELLE. Orange. BALAS RUBY. Rose-red.	8	Vitreous.	Transparent - Translucent -
TOPAZ. White, greenish, yellow, orange, cinnamon, bluish, pink.	8	Vitreous.	Transparent - Translucent -
EMERALD. Fine green. BERYL or AQUAMARINE. Pale sea-green, blue, yellow, white, rarely pink.	7.5 to 8	Vitreous.	Transparent -
HYACINTH or JACINTH. Brownish - yellow, brownish-red, cinnamon. JARGOON. Various shades of green, yellow, white and brown.	7.5	Vitreous; almost adamantine.	Transparent to opaque.
GARNET. ALMANDINE. Violet-red. CARBUNCLE. Red, brownish. CINNAMON STONE. White, yellow-orange, cinnamon. PYROPE. Vermilion or Bohemian garnet.	6.5 to 7.5	Vitreous, inclining to resinous.	Transparent to opaque.

Specific Gravity.	Refractive Index.	Dispersive Power.	Composition.
3.4 to 3.6	2.455 to 2.487	0.38	Pure carbon.
3.9 to 4.2	1.765	0.026	Alumina, 98.5 Iron oxide, 1.0 Lime, 0.5
3. to 3.8	1.760	0.033	Alumina, 80.2 Glucina, 19.8 (Traces of iron, lead and copper oxides.)
3.8	1.755 to 1.810	0.040	Alumina, 69.01 Magnesia, 26.21 Silica, 2.02 Iron oxide, 0.71 Chromium oxide, 1.10
3.5 to 3.6	1.635	0.025	Silica, 34.01 Alumina, 58.38 Fluorine, 15.06 (Traces of metal oxides.)
2.67 to 2.75	1.585	0.026	Silica, 68.50 Alumina, 15.75 Glucina, 12.50 Iron oxide, 1.00 Lime, 0.25
4.07 to 4.70	1.990	0.044	Zirconia, 66.80 Silica, 33.00 Iron oxide, 0.10
3.5 to 4.3	1.759	0.033	Silica, 38.25 Lime, 31.75 Alumina, 19.35 Iron oxide, 7.33 Magnesia, 2.40 Manganese oxide, 0.50

Name and Color.	Hardness.	Lustre.*	Diaphaneity.
TOURMALINE. Green, red, brown, yellow, blue, black, white.	7. to 7.5	Vitreous.	Transparent to opaque.
QUARTZ or ROCK CRYSTAL. White. AMETHYST. Violet. CAIRNGORM. Yellow, brown. CHRYSOPTASE. Fine apple-green. CAT'S EYE. Chatoyant. PLASMA. Deep olive-green. JASPER. Yellow, red, green, black, brown. BLOODSTONE. Dark - green with red spots. CARNELION. Red, white, yellow. AGATE. Various colors. ONYX. Having black, brown and white layers. SARDONYX. Having red or brownish - red and white layers. MOCHA-STONE. Dendritic.	7	Vitreous.	Transparent to nearly opaque.
CHRYSOLEITE. PERIDOT. Olive-green. OLIVINE.	6 to 7	Vitreous.	Transparent. Translucent.
TURQUOISE. Blue, green, white.	6	Vitreous.	Opaque, but translucent at edges.
OPAL. Red, white, green, gray, black, yellow (iridescent).	5.5 to 6.5	Vitreous, inclining to resinous.	Semi - transparent.
PEARL. White, yellow, pink, black, violet, brown, gray.	2.5 to 3.5	Pearly.	Opaque; sometimes semi-transparent.

Specific Gravity.	Refractive Index.	Dispersive Power.	Composition.
2.99 to 3.3	1.625	0.028	Silica, 38.85 Alumina, 31.32 Magnesia, 13.89 Boric acid, 8.25 Fluorine, 2.28 Lime, 1.60 Iron oxide, 1.27 Soda, 1.28 Potash, 0.26
2.65	1.549	0.026	Silica, 99.37 Alumina, 0.63  AMETHYST. Silica, 97.50 Alumina, 0.50 Iron oxide, 1.50 Manganese oxide, 0.50
3.3 to 3.44	1.660	0.033	Magnesia, 50.14 Silica, 39.73 Iron oxide, 9.19 Nickel oxide, 0.32 Alumina, 0.22 Manganese oxide, 0.09
2.62 to 3.	?	?	Alumina, 47.45 Phosphoric acid, 27.34 Calcium phos., 3.41 Copper oxide, 2.05 Iron oxide, 1.10 Manganese oxide, 0.50 Water, 18.18
2. to 2.3	?	?	Silica, 91.32 Water, 8.68 (Traces of coloring matter.)
2.5 to 2.7	None.	None.	Carbonate of lime and organic matter.

on an average, were employed in the far-famed mines of Golconda, and a single sovereign, Sultan Mahmoud, amassed during his reign of thirty-two years, 400 pounds weight of this precious stone, but to-day the supply from that region seems to be nearly if not quite exhausted. In the early part of the eighteenth century diamonds were discovered in Brazil, and the output was enormous, but the discovery proved a curse to the inhabitants; for, as soon as the home government learned of the valuable treasures, it expelled the rightful owners from their lands, declared the diamond-trade a monopoly, and itself the exclusive proprietor. Not till some seventy-five years later was a sad remnant of the descendants of those exiles allowed to regain a part of their rightful possessions, but in the meantime the yield had begun to fail, and at the present date it is relatively insignificant. Diamonds are known to exist in Russia, but the search has not been systematic, and the yield is small. Borneo has about dropped out of the list of diamond-producing countries, and Australia does not seem to have fulfilled the hopes of a few years ago. The United States, Mexico, and Canada have each furnished a few diamonds, just enough to show that there may be more where those came from, but not enough to interfere with the markets elsewhere. At the present day the diamond fields of the world are those of South Africa, which supply 95 per cent. of all the diamonds that are being put on the markets of the world just now. Since their discovery in 1867, they have yielded nearly ten tons of diamonds, and that is more than the yield of the rest of the world for the past two centuries. They have been valued in the rough at \$300,000,000, and after cutting, at more than double that sum.

#### SOME REMARKABLE DIAMONDS.

*The Braganza.*—The Braganza forms part of the crown-jewels of Portugal. It was found in Brazil by a slave in 1741. It is said to weigh 1880 carats, or nearly 16 ounces Troy, and has been estimated on paper to be worth \$275,000,000, but grave doubts are entertained as to its genuineness, and as the Portuguese government absolutely refuses to allow it to be examined, no trustworthy estimate of its value can be made, and the doubts have become, in the minds of mineralogists, almost a certainty. They now generally suspect it to be simply a colorless Topaz.

*The Muttam.*—This gem was found in Borneo in 1760, and weighs 367 carats, or a little over 3 ounces. It was once the cause of a sanguinary war, but the Rajah of Mattam stuck to his diamond through thick and thin, and his successor holds it yet. The Dutch Governor of Batavia offered him two gunboats, all armored and provisioned, and a sum of \$250,000 for it, but the Rajah refused saying that the fortunes of his family depended on its possession.

*The Koh-I-Noor* (Mountain of Light).—When it was that this gem first came to the light of upper day is not known. The Hindoos claim that it was already in their possession way back in the fabulous times of their god, Krischna. Taking this yarn as a starting point, more square-yards of lies have been told about this stone than would paper Münch-

hausen's front parlor. One account tells how it was turned up by a peasant in plowing, and traces its wanderings, almost year by year, ever since. This is clear and satisfactory, until somebody else strikes in, and relates how it was *first* discovered in the mines of Golconda, some three centuries later. And then, as if it were not enough to expect us to swallow all that, some one else tries his hand at inventing, and assures us, without a particle of evidence to back him up, that it was *originally* found forty miles from Golconda, in a cave. Next, one authority says it weighed when rough, over 800 carats, another puts it 793 just, another at 186. One says it was cut down to 284, and subsequently to 180 carats, another says 186, another 106, and still another 102½. Some call it a Brilliant, some a Rose. It has been traced from hand to hand, the transitions being generally effected by a big breach in the Seventh Commandment, till at last the historian, in all innocence, tell us that it "fell into the hands of the British soldiers" at Lahore in 1849. After this last "discovery" it was of course, presented to "Victoria, by the grace of God, etc." It is valued at \$10,000,000.

*The Orloff.*—The Orloff weighs 194½ carats. It is supposed to have formed one of the eyes of an idol in a Brahmanic temple, or to have been set in the throne of Nadir Shah. Be that as it may, it was certainly obtained from the East by theft, and sold in Malabar for \$14,000. The Empress Catherine II. of Russia, bought it in 1724 for about \$450,000 and an annuity of \$20,000, and a title of *nobility*. It is a perfect gem in every respect, and measures 1¼ inches in diameter, and nearly 1 inch in thickness, and is valued to-day even higher than the price which Catherine paid. It still belongs to the crown of Russia.

*The Regent or Pitt.*—Pitt, when Governor of Fort St. George, in Sumatra, in 1717, sold a diamond to the Regent of France, for \$675,000. He was accused of having stolen it from a poor Indian who had found it, and was lampooned by Pope unceremoniously, but wrote a pamphlet to prove his innocence, and of course succeeded in doing so. Anyhow, it weighed 410 carats in the rough, but was reduced to 136¾ in the cutting, which operation took two years of labor and cost \$17,500. It is absolutely faultless, and was valued by the Commission of Jewelers at Paris, in 1791, at \$2,500,000. The Emperor Napoleon I. wore it in the pommel of his sword.

*The Sancy.*—The Sancy is a beautiful stone, of a pear-shape, cut as a Rose both on the top and on the bottom (double-rose), and weighs 56½ carats. It cost originally \$600,000, but was afterwards sold for more than double that sum. Where it came from is not known. It first appears on the scene in the possession of Charles the Bold, who lost it in the battle of Granson, 1477. It was found by a Swiss who sold it for about 50 cents to a priest who, on re-selling it, raised the price to 75 cents. It was then lost sight of for more than 100 years, when it turned up in the hands of a king of Portugal, who sold it to the Baron de Sancy, from whom it received the name which it has retained. Sancy was Treasurer of the King, and Henry III. borrowed it, and sent it as a pledge to the Swiss government, but the messenger was mur-



dered on the way. For a long time nothing further was heard of the diamond, till at last it was learned that the faithful servant, rather than give it up had swallowed it. His grave was found, and the gem recovered and restored to its owner. Sancy next disposed of it to James II. of England, who in turn sold it to Louis XIV. for \$125,000. During the French Revolution it was stolen, together with other gems to the value of several millions, very few of which were ever recovered. The Sancy however was found again by the police of the Champs Elysées, through an anonymous letter. Finally, Napoleon I. bought it and afterwards re-sold it to Prince Paul Demidoff of Russia, in which country it has since rested from its journeyings.

*The Blue Diamond.*—This diamond belonged to the crown-jewels of France, but was stolen at the same time as the Sancy. It was never recovered. There is a rumor however that it was sold in 1835 by an agent of the Bourbons to the Emperor of Russia for \$250,000, though it was valued in its day at \$600,000. It was, or is, a magnificent stone, of a rich and rare sky-blue color. We have no record of its weight.

*The Star of the South*—This is a Brazilian diamond, found by a negress in July 1853. It weighed in the rough, 254½ carats, but the cutting reduced it to 125. Though not perfectly pure it is one of the finest diamonds extant. It is owned by the renowned gem-cutter, Coster of Amsterdam.

#### CROWN JEWELS.

The crown of Ivan Alexiowitch, of Russia, contained 881 diamonds, all brilliants; that of Peter the Great 847; that of Catherine 2536, and immense numbers have been added since her day to the crown-jewels of Russia.

The crown-jewels of France, before the great theft in 1792, were estimated at over \$5,000,000, more than half of which were diamonds.

Nizam, king of Golconda, had a diamond valued at \$1,000,000, and which weighed 340 carats.

The Queen of England, at her coronation, June 28, 1838, wore a crown weighing a little over three pounds, adorned with about 400 diamonds, the total value of the crown being about \$555,000. The historian of the event makes a remark which sounds funny enough now: "In the front of the Maltese cross which is in front of the crown is the enormous heart-shaped ruby once worn by the chivalrous Edward the Black Prince, but now destined to adorn the head of a virgin queen."

Other sovereigns of Europe and elsewhere have, of course, jewels in their crowns, befitting their dignity, but we have not the time or space to enumerate them here.

Since writing the above, we have come across a description, in the *Catholic Standard*, of March 16, 1895, of several of the diamonds just mentioned. The account agrees substantially with our own, but the *Standard* adds a new and remarkable piece of information well worth repeating. It is to the effect that a magnificent diamond has lately been discovered in the Transvaal Republic, in South Africa. It weighs 971¾ carats, and is of a bluish-white color, and, but for one black spot in the

centre, is practically perfect. The finder was rewarded with a present of \$750 and a horse and saddle. The first estimate places its value at \$1,000,000, and the President of the little Republic has made a present of it to Pope Leo XIII.

#### THE UNITED STATES.

It is refreshing to find one thing in this, our beloved land, in which we cannot, and do not, claim to beat the universe, earth, planets and all. That one thing is the production of diamonds. The total value of all found here during the last fifteen years does not probably reach \$1000. To make up for this we have, according to Kuntz, imported quite heavily especially in recent years. Thus since 1868 there have passed through our Custom House, diamonds to the value of \$120,000,000, three-quarters of which were entered during the last twelve years. From 3 to 4 per cent. of them were in the rough state, but of those entered as "cut" a very large proportion were for re-cutting, a job which we flatter ourselves we are able to do to a nicety, and a little better than the rest of the world.

Although we have no crown-jewels, yet some of our "uncrowned kings" own gems as of great intrinsic value as are those of many a king or emperor. When in 1886 the crown-jewels of France were sold, not of course for the sake of the filthy lucre, but merely because there was found no head on which the crown of a Charlemagne could fit, about one-third of them (including four of the famous "Mazarins") came to the United States. We paid for that lot over \$500,000, and it was dirt cheap. There are now ear-rings in the country worth from \$5000 to \$8000 a pair, and necklaces which are valued at from \$100,000 to over \$300,000 each, and other things in proportion. One Bishop has a mitre worth, principally on account of its jewels, \$30,000. Another has a chalice, valued for the same reason, at \$10,000. Another a pectoral cross estimated at \$5000, and the quantity of precious church regalia is steadily increasing.

In the first group of our list we have placed *bort and carbonate*. The former is merely such bits and fragments of diamond as are too small, or are for other reasons unfit, to be used as gems. They are ground up and used for polishing. The latter seems to be an imperfectly crystallized carbon. It is equally hard with the diamond, but being opaque, it is useless as a gem. It is powdered and employed for polishing.

There is also a Black Diamond which is even harder than the ordinary precious gem, and on that account it is preferred for the manufacture of diamond drills and other cutting instruments.

We had intended to give a brief account of nearly all the other gems mentioned in the Table, but space fails us, and so we are obliged to defer the project till another time.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

## Book Notices.

REVEALED RELIGION; From the "Apologie des Christenthums" of Franz Hettinger, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Wurzburg. Edited with an Introduction on the Assent of Faith. By *Henry Sebastian Bowden*, of the Oratory. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 225. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Pu-tet & Co.

Doctor Hettinger's great work "Apologie des Christenthums" has long since procured for him a position in the front rank of Catholic theologians. It has been translated into nearly every European language, and the first volume of the English translation, entitled, "Natural Religion," which appeared in 1892, has already reached a second edition. Now we have the second volume entitled, "Revealed Religion." Father Bowden of the Oratory, who makes the translation is familiar with Doctor Hettinger's text, for in 1885 he gave to the English speaking world, a translation of the same author's great work on Dante, of which a second edition was published last year.

The volume before us begins with an Introduction by the translator on "The Assent of Faith." The work proper is divided into seven chapters treating of the "Possibility of Revelation," the "Necessity of Revelation," "Miracles and Prophecy," the "Credibility of the Gospels," the "Divinity of Christ," "Prophecy and Fulfilment," and "Christ and Christianity." There is an appendix dealing with "The Tübingen Theory," and there is also an Index.

From the Preface to the book we gather the following explanation and summary of its contents:

"The claims of Christianity are to be tested, according to the modern scientific method, like those of any human creed. Its origin must be sought in the ideas, political, philosophical, religious, current at its birth, and their influence, on the mind of its founder. Its moral worth will be determined by its agreement with the conclusions of reason, and its power of satisfying the higher needs of mankind. Thus, religion is treated like a philosophy or a language, as merely the product of human thought, and the notion of Revelation is set aside. Now reason may indeed reject a creed as worthless, if its doctrines, though professedly revealed, are manifestly absurd and licentious, as are those of Mahomedanism. But where the morality is undoubtedly pure, as is the case with Christianity, the only logical mode of inquiry is to examine, not the nature of the doctrines, in themselves professedly incomprehensible, but the external evidence for the fact that those doctrines are a revelation from God. Such is the method pursued by the earlier Christian apologists, and adopted in the present volume." Revelation presupposes the existence of God. The evidence for this fundamental truth appears in the first volume of Doctor Hettinger's work, entitled "Natural Religion." Revealed religion is founded on faith, as natural religion is founded on reason, and since this term is variously understood, the editor in the Introduction treats of its precise theological sense, and the nature and motive of the assent which it requires.

"A revelation, however, could never claim acceptance unless it showed external signs of its authenticity, and this evidence is found in the visible, supernatural facts of miracles and prophecies. The characteristics

of such phenomena have then to be fully considered, and their possibility demonstrated from the existence of an omnipotent Creator. Now comes the turning-point of the whole inquiry. Have these facts ever occurred, or, in other words, are the Gospels credible?" They are. It is shown that the narrative of the Evangelists is an accurate historical account of facts that really occurred; that is supported by the testimony of trustworthy contemporary witnesses, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and that must be admitted as true if we wish to account for the foundation of Christianity. This evidence has been attacked most fiercely by the followers of the rationalistic school of the University of Tübingen in Würtemberg, led by F. C. Bauer. They are answered by Rev. H. Cator of the Oratory in the Appendix.

"But as regards miracles, saints in all times have worked them; what was then peculiar to Christ's? The saints wrought miracles in the power of God, and to approve themselves His messengers; Christ worked miracles in His own power and to attest His own divinity; and the last miracle of His earthly life, His Resurrection, was the crowning proof of His claim to be the Son of God. Hence the miracles of Christ, and especially His Resurrection, require to be examined from this point of view. For the same reason, the proof from prophecy has to be separately considered, for the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ furnishes even stronger evidence than the miracles that He alone was the Messiah, the God-man foretold. And again, the accomplishment in His Church of the predictions which He Himself made of His future kingdom testifies to His divinity with increasing force, as each successive age witnesses their fulfilment." The rationalists try to explain the rise and spread of Christianity by merely human causes, and they point to Mahomedanism and Buddhism in proof of their contention. Dr. Hettinger disposes of those gentlemen very successfully and very quickly.

"The leading objections against Christianity have been the same in all time, and Dr. Hettinger, in dealing with them, naturally takes the Fathers and Schoolmen for his guides. These objections fall always under two chief heads. The rationalists, like the Jews, deny the fact of Revelation; the skeptics, like the Gentiles, its possibility." The moderns have added nothing to the arguments of the ancients, and in many instances they use the very same words. This is illustrated in the assertion that the Resurrection was the mere invention of a deluded woman. The words of Origen are still applicable: "The incredible character of such assertions palpably betrays their falsehood." The letters of the Mahatmas are accepted as authentic, while the Epistles of St. Paul are rejected as spurious. Any conjecture, no matter how uncritical, wild, or irrational, if it be anti-Christian, is accepted as fact, while Christian facts are rejected as conjectures.

We have an illustration of this in the "scientific" explanation which Bauer, the founder of the Tübingen school, makes of the formation of the Christian Gospels. He says that they were forged late in the second century, apparently by apostolic authority, to bring about the reconciliation of the rival parties led by Peter and Paul, which, until then, had divided the Christian Body.

Now this is a mere assumption, supported by no evidence and contradicted by a successive chain of witnesses from Clement to Irenæus.

This sameness in the objections against Christianity is emphasised when we notice that, so far from aiding the skeptics, every true advance in Biblical learning made in this century, such as Tatian's "Diatessa-

ron," the "Apology" of Aristides, and the "Epitaph" of St. Abercius, corroborates, directly or indirectly, the traditional authority of the Gospels, and the unbroken, continuous unity of the Christian Church. A striking illustration of the rash manner in which the enemies of Christianity assert, deny, and assume, in the same breath, is furnished by their treatment of the "Diatessaron," a document which shows the supreme and exclusive authority enjoyed by the Gospels, four in number, at the time of its composition, about A.D. 150, or within fifty years of the date of St. John's Gospel. In 1875, Mr. Bauer disposed of this troublesome document by saying, "it seems never to have been seen, probably for the simple reason that there was no such work." Now, that ought to end all discussion of the matter; but, unfortunately for Mr. Bauer, in 1888, an Arabic version of the "Diatessaron" containing the four Gospels, including St. John's, in their entirety, with the exception of the genealogies, was brought to light in the Vatican library by Father Ciasca, and published with his Latin translation. This might have silenced a more modest man, but the oracle of the Tübingen school hardly excels in that virtue. He returns to the attack undaunted. "Without any apology for the groundlessness of his previous assertion, and with a happy contempt for facts and evidence, he finds traces, invisible to others, of an apocryphal gospel, the Pseudo-Peter, in the work before him, and declares that it ought to have been called the 'Dipente.' Thus, now that the document declared by him as probably non-existent is discovered, he asserts that it is not what it calls itself, and that he knows more about it than the author himself; and this audacity succeeds; not, indeed, with any competent judge, but with the public at large. Like the twice-slain hero of a melodrama, our critic returns sound and scathless at the end of the piece to receive the popular applause."

It must not be supposed that the author of this work discusses all objections against Christianity in particular. No defence can do that, because anti-Christian hypotheses are multitudinous, and for the most part ephemeral, for they are born and die within an hour, while many of them are mutually destructive. "Since 1850, there have been published 747 theories regarding the Old and the New Testament, of which 608 are now defunct. The aim of the present volume, then, has been to bring clearly to the front the leading principles of Christianity and skepticism, as the most valid and effective method of inquiry into the whole subject, and of elucidating the truth."

In doing this, the author follows the traditional methods of defence, and for this reason his work will not please those who belong to the modern school of Biblical criticism. They assume two principles as certain: first, that scholastic theology is no longer a serviceable weapon; and secondly, that it is their task to recast Catholic truth in one or other form of modern thought.

But this new school of apologists has not produced good results. Its more conspicuous members have many times committed themselves to untenable positions, and have, more than once, incurred the condemnation of the Church. The real result, then, of their labors has been the production of hybrid doctrines, condemned by the Church, and rejected by the non-Catholic schools, which they were intended to conciliate. The reason is plain. The contempt of these writers for theology proper led them to neglect the study of it, while their admiration for non-Catholic systems blinded them to the fundamental errors on which these systems are based.

"It cannot be denied that the scientific defence of Christian truth,

like everything finite, admits of improvement ; that different times require different treatment. . . . But it must also be remembered that, while the Church may change the form of her defence, as St. Peter used one set of arguments with the Jews, and St. Paul another with the Gentiles, her doctrines themselves are necessarily and always immutable. As she did not create the faith, neither can she change it. She teaches what she has heard ; she ordains what she has been told. She cannot modify one doctrine, or tamper with the exactness of its expression, even though by so doing she would win half the world. Her mission is to convert the nations to the truth, not to adapt the truth to them, and every attempt to do so must be fatal alike to the cause of truth and to the souls it is designed to save."

Now, although there are many systems for the exposition and defence of Catholic truth, and though they all have some good in them, there is only one system that has been specially commended by the Church in the past, and is unreservedly sanctioned in the present, and that is the scholastic method, but particularly the teaching of St. Thomas.

"The Summa is far more than Aristotle Christianized. It is the whole circle of revealed truth defined, defended and illustrated ; and the marvellous penetration, grasp and accuracy of the Angelic Doctor are attested by the many cases in which his conclusions have anticipated doctrinal decisions and refuted future heresies. For six centuries it has held a place absolutely unrivalled in the councils of the Church and in her theological schools. While, on the other hand, 'ever since its rise,' says Melchoir Canus, 'contempt of scholasticism and the pest of heresies have gone hand in hand.' Wycliff, Luther, Melancthon, the Jansenists, each in turn reviled the schoolmen, as do now the admirers of Hegel and Kant."

Dr. Hettinger follows this scholastic method, which has stood the test of time, incurred the hatred of heretics and merited the approval of the Church. But he is more than a safe teacher. He is interesting, clear and comprehensive. The book should do an immense amount of good, particularly in the hands of Catholic laymen, who are so frequently attacked on the subjects of which it treats. But its usefulness is by no means limited to Catholics. It will prove a good weapon of defence in the hands of all earnest Christians.

---

SOCIAL EVOLUTION. By *Benjamin Kidd*. McMillan & Co.: New York. Price 25 cents.

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards the theories of Evolution, Natural Selection, and the Survival of the Fittest, has generally been unfavorably criticised by the scientific world, and by that larger public which is inclined to regard the Church as opposed to all progress. Catholic writers, from St. Augustine<sup>1</sup> onward (as President White, of Cornell University, has recently pointed out in his chapters on "The Warfare of Science") have had glimpses of the ideas embraced under the general term Evolution. But, since it has been propounded as a system, the great writers and teachers of the Church have preferred to await further developments before accepting theories which, when enunciated, were regarded by their supporters as likely to create a permanent breach between science and religion.

---

<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine suggests the adoption of the old evolution or emanation theory, dwells on a potential creation, as involved in the actual creation, and speaks of animals "whose numbers the aftertime unfolded" "New Chapters on the Warfare of Science," *Popular Science Monthly*, August, 1894.

Now, however, a new era has dawned with the rise of the modern school of evolutionists, of whom Mr. Kidd is one.

In the introduction to his "Social Evolution," the work under consideration, in speaking of religion, he says: "The time is certainly not far distant when science must look back with surprise, if not, indeed, with some degree of shamefacedness, to the attitude in which she has for so long addressed herself to one of the highest problems in the history of life."

Mr. Kidd's book is not as well known as it ought to be among Catholics. The author is, in fact, still a young man, only thirty-five years of age. He is an ardent Protestant (strangely ignorant, indeed, of the fundamental principles of the Catholic Church), and is regarded by his antagonists in England as an advanced socialist.

The work divides itself, apparently without Mr. Kidd's intention, into two distinct parts. In the first, he attempts to define the moral, and even the ethical, value of the theories based on Professor Weismann's physiological discovery of "*unalterable cells*." This portion of the work is beyond the scope of this article, but we will attempt to state Mr. Kidd's position as simply as possible. In his opinion, the "unalterable cells" are not only the evidence of design in creation, they are, also, the source of what he regards as the "supernatural" principle which is "opposed to reason"—of that spirit which is the only motive power of moral progress in the past, the only hope of humanity in the future.<sup>1</sup> It would appear to many of us that Mr. Kidd, in applying this theory, attempts to prove too much; but, even if his conclusions are only half-truths, in science they do not invalidate the ethical importance of the second part of his work.

In this, he uses various scientific and historical arguments to show the development in the past of the moral sense, as superior to reason, and to prove the evolution and ultimate triumph of the principle which "makes for righteousness," which we call the spirit of Christianity, and Mr. Kidd terms Altruism.

This idea is familiar to every Catholic child who has studied his catechism, but, until Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Date of Ethics," the term was not scientifically used, and it has never before been stated as a controlling factor in the science of Evolution. There is some ground, perhaps, for the comment in the article (said to be by the Duke of Argyll) on this work in the *Edinburgh Review*, for January, 1894, which speaks of "Altruism—this being the new and very affected name for the old familiar things which we used to call charity, benevolence, and love." But we acknowledge a debt of gratitude to Mr. Kidd, for his efforts to bring evolutionary science into line with what Carlyle calls the "eternal verities," and pardon him for using a terminology which does not, at least to Catholics, materially obscure his meaning.

His book begins with a review of the condition of humanity at the end of the present century, and of the spirit of restlessness and discontent which are its characteristics, as exemplified in the works of Prof. Huxley and others. But Mr. Kidd regards these views as the expression of a phase of thought which is passing away. "To the mind," he says, "which can rise above the pessimism of the later half of the nineteenth century, the twentieth has begun to dawn. . . . The air is full

<sup>1</sup> Those who care to do so, will be repaid for reading Professor Weismann's recent works, and the still more recent controversy between Mr. Herbert Spencer and himself in the *Contemporary Review*. In fact, all the great Reviews have had articles on this controversy within the past year, showing the great importance which is attached to the theories of Professor Weismann.

of new battle-cries, of the sound of the gathering and marshalling of new forces, and of the reorganization of old ones." The book is filled with the spirit of hopefulness, which gives it a rare charm. Even to Catholics, whose faith is as a beacon on a rock, life of late has been saddened by the sound of the waves of unbelief and discontent beating about its foundations; while those outside the Church, who have done most to form the ideas of the present generation, are discouraged by the ideals which they have themselves created.

For the various lines of argument by which Mr. Kidd supports his optimistic views of the future of humanity, the reader is referred to his book; but it must be remarked that, in the chapter on the Current Definitions of Religion, not a single definition from the Catholic standpoint is included. Perhaps the fact that a whole world of thought is thus ignored, accounts for the inadequacy of the treatment to the subject.

Mr. Kidd's chapters on Western Civilization contain the most sympathetic exposition of the development of that civilization which is possible for one who does not possess the faith which is the key to that development. "The early centuries of our era," observes the author, "possess the deepest interest for the scientific mind." "The old religions," he quotes from Froude, speaking of Cæsar's time, "were dead, from the Pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates and the Nile, and the principles upon which human society has been constructed were dead also." The new forces which were born into the world with the Christian religion were evidently, from the first, of immeasurable social significance. "There sprang from Christianity," observes Lecky,<sup>1</sup> "an aggressive and, at the same time, disciplined enthusiasm, wholly unlike any other which has been witnessed on earth. The Christian religion possessed, from the outset, two characteristics destined to render it an evolutionary force of the first magnitude. The first was the extraordinary strength of the ultra rational sanction it provided. The second was the nature of the ethical system associated with it."

Mr. Kidd considers, in rapid review, the Christian persecutions; the "extraordinary epidemic of asceticism" which overran the world, of which he says: "many writers of philosophical insight still altogether misunderstand the significance of this movement"; the development of Western Europe into a "vast theocracy"; the gradual disappearance of the ideal of the Holy Roman Empire; the extinction of the principle of caste; the progress towards individual liberty.

The parallel development of Christianity and civilization through these forces is traced to the period of the Renaissance, "the great watershed which divides the modern world from the old," and to the Reformation, of which Mr. Kidd remarks, in this place, "to the evolutionist this movement is essentially a social development."

Since that period, the abolition of slavery, the extinction of feudalism, the progressive legislation towards universal suffrage, and the "revolt of labor," are enumerated by Mr. Kidd as triumphs of the altruistic spirit. The characteristics of the present period of western civilization he believes to be intense individualism and altruistic enthusiasm.

His views on Socialism, interesting as they are—for he invests them with ethical significance—cannot be considered in this article. From his facts and theories, Mr. Kidd derives the conclusion that "the evolution which is slowly proceeding in human society does not tend

<sup>1</sup> Lecky's *History of European Morals*, p. 490.



towards Socialism, but towards the elevation to the highest power of individualism, through the principle of altruism."

So far, the conclusions which Mr. Kidd draws from his premises run in parallel lines with those accepted by the Catholic Church. It is, however, impossible for its members to accede to his views as to the results of the so-called Reformation. In support of his own opinion, he quotes Prof. Marshall, who states, in his Theory of Economics that "the doctrines of the Reformation deepened the character of the English people, reacted on their habits of life, and gave a tone to their industries. Family life was so intensified that the family life of those races which have adopted the reformed religion are the fullest and richest in earthly feeling."

Surely history contradicts the statement of Prof. Marshall, that at the period of the Reformation, "*for the first time* large numbers of rude and uncultivated people yearned towards the mysteries of absolute spiritual freedom." Has he forgotten the wonder expressed, even by non-Catholic historians, at the rapid evangelization of the masses by the Church from the apostolic age onward?

"The softening and deepening of character" which was accomplished, according to Mr. Kidd, by the Reformation "was accompanied by a release into our lives of an immense and all pervading fund of altruistic feeling which has provided the motive force behind the whole onward movement with which our age is identified." But Catholics do not admit this. Leaving aside the history of the Church in the past, what evidence have we among Protestants to-day of such self-sacrifice as Father Damien's, such heroism as that of the Martyrs in China? Noble and public spirited as they often are, have Protestants ever emulated the "all pervading altruism" of our religious orders, or even the lives of perpetual self-denial of our parish priests? How can the family life be "fullest and freest" in forms of religion which admit, if they do not sanction divorce?

The anarchistic spirit which is the terror of every government in Europe had no existence where the monastic orders mediated between the rich and the poor, and many thinkers look forward to even a partial adoption of the views expressed in the Labor Encyclical of the present Pope as the only possible *modus vivendi* between Labor and Capital. The bond of charity which it inculcates would, no doubt, lead to the triumph of the altruistic spirit, while the philanthropy of Protestantism seeks to remove evils because they are an injury to the body politic, rather than for the sake of the individual.

The conclusions which Mr. Kidd draws from the data which he has collected seem to us singularly inadequate. The future which he predicts, and about which he is so hopeful, is based entirely on the ultimate supremacy of the English-speaking races, inspired by Protestantism, with the New Democracy as their gospel. Students of history will scarcely admit that the altruistic method has been adopted hitherto by England in her acquisition and government of territory and population. The Report of the Royal Commission on the Present Condition of Labor in Great Britain would indicate that if Protestantism gave a tone to her industries, it was a lamentably low one; while it does not appear that the New Demos carries the olive branch of altruistic peace into the present conflicts between Labor and Capital.

We cannot, therefore, accept Mr. Kidd's conclusions, but we are, nevertheless, grateful to him for a work which is thoughtful and suggestive, a mass of information which is valuable to every reader, a disciplined hopefulness, and a reverent interpretation of the mysteries of

science. We only regret his want of knowledge or appreciation of the Catholic Church, for we believe that she, who in the past has done more for social morality than any religion on earth, is destined to carry to its ultimate development that spirit of Christ which the philosophers of to-day call Altruism.

---

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION. Being an Examination of Spencer's Religion of the Unknowable, preceded by a History of Agnosticism. Dissertation for the Doctorate in Theology at the Catholic University of America. By *Rev. George J. Lucas*. Cloth, 8vo., pp. 136. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1895.

It is, indeed, most fitting that the first candidate for the degree of Doctor of Divinity at the Catholic University of America should choose for the subject of his dissertation "Agnosticism and Religion." A superficial observer of events might think some other subject more appropriate. He might be tempted to assert that the student of the Catholic University should devote his time and energy to the defence of the Church as the agent of an Incarnate God. But such an assertion would not be wise, because, at the present time, men are not attacking Christ, His Divinity, or the authority of His Church, but they are attacking God Himself. Why should a man busy himself building up an elaborate superstructure upon a foundation which his enemies are striving, by every means in their power, to destroy. He must first look to the foundation, and make it firm beyond question, before he builds higher. So the wise student does not strive to prove the Divinity of Christ and the authority of His Church while the world is denying, either directly or by implication, even the existence of God. Such is the deplorable state of affairs at the present time.

Physical science has made such rapid strides in recent years, and has wrought such wonderful changes, that men have forgotten its province and its limitations. Every new discovery brings about again the comparison between science and religion, and while it is true that the great majority of scientific men believe that religion is not injured but benefited by evolution, yet there are some scientists who claim that evolution destroys God. This doctrine is preached here and in Europe. has become the common creed at universities of both continents, is spread over the pages of the leading magazines of the world, and is borne into the houses of the people in general on the wings of the daily newspaper. An eminent writer tells us that in the universities of England this creed predominates among the undergraduates and the younger dons, and we venture to say that if some one should sound the minds of the young students of our own universities whose brains are running to hair, he would find that they can talk more learnedly about Herbert Spencer and the Unknowable, than about any other subject except football. We have recently heard of a young gentleman, age thirteen, who, when asked to say the Apostle's Creed by his mother, informed her that he couldn't, because he didn't believe in the Resurrection of the Body.

It is so much more easy to say that a thing is unknowable than to try to know it. This is particularly true of metaphysical and supernatural subjects, although we do not see why the term might not be applied to all sorts of troublesome things.

Doctor Lucas sees this widespread atheistic and agnostic tendency, and, like a true doctor, he studies the subject. He finds that the fruits of this science are the extinction of all future hopes, of all true morality, of righteousness, and of the nobility of man's intellect. He

finds that this scientific anti-religionism embodies itself in Agnosticism, of which Messrs. Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer are the apostles, and that of these three Mr. Spencer is the acknowledged leader. Indeed, it can be truthfully said that this gentleman is the personification of Religious Agnosticism. To him, then, Dr. Lucas finally turns his attention.

It is difficult to get these gentlemen to make a definite statement of their views, and to hold it for any time. Nothing is more characteristic of them than shifting and contradiction. They not only cut the ground away from under the feet of their colleagues and buffet them with contradictions, but as they take up their own stand on quicksands, they are constantly seeking new footing. The most complete and systematic expression of Religious Agnosticism is found in the first part of the first volume of Mr. Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy," a work in ten volumes, and it is entitled "The Unknowable." To this work Dr. Lucas devotes his attention. He states the case in this way:

"The criticism of 'The Unknowable,' which we are about to enter on, will, in its main outlines, be simply this: a plain and sincere investigation of the Agnostic Metaphysic and Agnostic Science, and Religion for religious sovereignty. It will be simply this: Has Religious and scientific Agnosticism brought valid reasons for the repudiation of the Living God, and the substitution of the Unknowable, Non-Living God in His stead? Or, on the contrary, is Agnosticism but a passing storm—a blast and blare of trumpets, summoning an army of mere spectral fancies against the philosophic and truly scientific phalanxes of good solid facts and good solid arguments which surround the inexpugnable fortress of the concept of a Personal God, and of its correlate, a Theistic Religion? This latter we maintain, and will endeavor to make good in our criticism of Mr. Spencer."

Every fair-minded reader who follows the author through the pages of this book will acknowledge, in the end, that he has succeeded in his undertaking. The first part of the work is devoted to "The History of the Rise of Agnosticism from Xenophanes to Spencer," and the second to "The Examination of Spencer's Religion of the Unknowable."

The book is worthy of the attention of all persons who are interested in the subject, but we must warn our readers that only a mind that has been trained in a scientific, philosophical, theological school can hope to understand it. We really think that one of the principal reasons why there are so many disciples of Huxley, Tyndall and Spencer is because so many silly, ignorant boys curiously pry into their teachings. Their minds cannot digest such food, and, mentally, they die of indigestion. Like moths, they hover near the flame until their wings are singed, and they are no longer able to rise in thought above the "Unknowable." We should feed such infants on the good, wholesome, easily-digested food of an act of faith. But to philosophers, theologians, scientists and students in general of mature mind we should say confidently, read Doctor Lucas's book.

---

HISTORY OF ST. PHILOMENA. Edited by *Charles Henry Bowdon*, Priest of the *Oratory*. 16mo, paper, pp. 320. London: Art and Book Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is a very interesting history of the finding of the body of the Saint, and the rapid growth of devotion to her. It is the work of an anonymous writer, but the greatest care has been taken to verify its statements by reference in most cases, and whenever possible to original sources. On the twenty-fourth of May, 1802, the excavators in the

catacomb of St. Priscilla, discovered a remarkable tombstone that had evidently never been disturbed since it had originally been placed there. When the authorized officials were summoned they found the tomb closed with three terra-cotta slabs on which were inscribed the words, "Pax Tecum Philomena," with the emblems of martyrdom. When the tomb was opened, they found the remains of a virgin and martyr who had been put to death at an early age; for it was evident from the size of the bones, particularly those of the head, that the child had received her crown probably when twelve or thirteen years old. Nothing is known of the life of the saint except what has been learned from private revelations, or what has been gathered from the deductions of the archæologist. The present history does not record private revelations, but we learn from De Rossi the archæologist of our own day, and from Bosio, who has been named the father of Christian archæology, that St. Philomena lived and died in the apostolic age; that is to say during the lifetime of those who received the faith from the apostles themselves, and therefore not later than the years 150 or 160 A.D.

The remains of the holy martyr and the broken phial still containing some of her congealed blood were removed to the treasury of sacred relics at Rome, where they remained till 1805. In that year they were transferred by permission of Pope Pius VII. to Mugnano, about five miles from Naples, where they have remained to the present day, and where a magnificent church has been erected in their honor. Pilgrims from all parts of the world visit this church every year and obtain through the intercession of St. Philomena great favors both temporal and eternal. Indeed, so frequent and wonderful are the miracles wrought by this saint, that she is called the miracle worker of the nineteenth century. She is known also as the playful saint, because of the nature of some of these miracles.

It is recorded that when the bishop to whom had been entrusted the reliquary containing the remains of the saint was about to leave Rome, he placed it in an obscure part of the vehicle which was used for transportation, although he had promised to carry it much more becomingly. The Saint reminded him of his promise and of his neglect by striking him several sharp blows, nor did she let him rest until he kept his word. In the scoffer this narration may excite laughter, but it is simply a question of fact, which has been verified and strengthened by many other like facts.

As the editor of this life very well says: "The marvels attributed to this Saint have been so manifold, and so notorious among the faithful, that it would be unreasonable to hesitate in giving credence to them. Extraordinary though they be, they are not isolated occurrences, but have been repeated over and over again in different countries and under various climes. They have taken place in presence of numbers of credible witnesses, have been attested by formal and trustworthy documents, and many of them have been subjected to minute episcopal investigation. The Church through her Supreme Head, has sanctioned the public worship of this Saint after mature deliberation; she has many times opened her sacred treasures and enriched it with spiritual favors and indulgences. It is thereby sufficiently recommended to Catholic piety as founded upon a solid basis and possessing every desirable guarantee."

In the year 1837 Pope Gregory XVI. issued a decree authorizing the public worship of St. Philomena; a Mass and Office were written in her honor, and although at first their use was restricted to the diocese of Nola, the bishops of many other dioceses soon sought and obtained per-

mission to use them. This is the only instance of a proper Mass and Office being granted in honor of a Saint from the catacombs, of whom nothing is known except her name and the fact of her martyrdom. Pope Pius IX. while Archbishop of Imola, was cured by this Saint, and introduced her devotion into his cathedral city. During his exile from Rome when he was Pope, he made a pilgrimage in person to her shrine. Pope Leo XIII., while apostolic administrator of the diocese of Benevento, made two pilgrimages to this holy shrine, and after he became Pope, sent a valuable cross from the Vatican Exposition to the rector of the church where the Saint lies.

Devotion to St. Philomena is not widespread in this country, but if this little history were read, we believe that it would grow rapidly. It may interest the readers of the *QUARTERLY* in Philadelphia, to know that there is an altar to St. Philomena in St. Mary's Church in this city.

---

**LOYALTY TO CHURCH AND STATE.** The Mind of His Excellency, Francis Archbishop Satolli, Apostolic Delegate. 12mo., cloth, pp. 250. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1895.

It will astonish those who have not observed closely the movements of His Excellency, the Most Rev. Francis Satolli, Archbishop of Lepanto, and Delegate Apostolic to the United States, to know that this handsome book of two hundred and fifty pages is filled with addresses and speeches made by him since his arrival in America: and it will astonish such persons yet more to know that the unpublished speeches of His Excellency would fill another volume equally large. Those who have met the Most Rev. Apostolic Delegate know that he is an humble modest man of retiring disposition. He does not wish his movements to be heralded throughout the land, nor does he seek opportunities to force his opinions on the people. Much that he does is unobserved, except by those in immediate contact with him; and much that he says, is unheard except by his immediate hearers. And yet, occupying the exalted position of Delegate Apostolic to the United States, and combining in himself the master philosopher, theologian, and sociologist, his opinions are of very great value.

The whole world listens attentively to the voice of the great Leo, and is astonished at his deep insight of men and governments in all their relations. The learned world bows down in admiration before that great philosopher and theologian, St. Thomas of Aquin. But Monsignor Satolli is the foremost student of the Angel of the Schools in the world to-day, and he has been the favorite pupil from childhood of the great Leo XIII.

We may rest assured that the Father sent to his children in America a child after his own heart, one familiar with his views of men and affairs, and one gifted like himself with a keen knowledge of minds and hearts. The utterances of such a man are worthy of the closest attention and of the deepest study. The Reverend Gentleman who has placed them within our reach is indeed deserving of our gratitude.

These addresses and speeches were delivered on various occasions, and embrace a variety of subjects. There are several on Christian Education, addressed to schools, colleges, and alumni associations, in which true education is clearly distinguished from false, and the necessity for moral and religious training is most convincingly shown. Nor does the Most Reverend Speaker on these occasions fail to show that the Church is not antagonistic to Public or State Schools, which are good enough as far as they go, but she knows the need of something better, and provides it. There is no conflict between Church and State on the

question of education. The Church says to the State : " What you are doing is good, and therefore I will do it, but I will add to it, what all thoughtful men, irrespective of creed, acknowledge is necessary to complete education."

One of the longest addresses in the collection is that made before the Carroll Institute, Washington, D. C., February 26, 1895, on " The Relations of Church and State." This is a delicate subject in the United States at the present time, and a dishonest or cowardly man would be afraid to approach it ; but the Most Rev. Delegate Apostolic was glad of the opportunity to let the light of truth shine full on this great question, which so many wicked, narrow-minded, cowardly, bigoted men try so hard to befog ; and the Monsignor knows so well how to clear away the clouds and let in the sunlight. He does not seek to flatter with sweet words, nor to mislead with many words, but in a straightforward, clear, concise manner, taking for his text the late encyclical of the Holy Father, he shows that the State has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from the existence of the Catholic Church in her midst.

In addition to those that we have spoken of, there are addresses made on the occasions of jubilees and dedications ; to clubs and societies ; to congresses ; on temperance ; and on the training of youth.

They are all remarkable for clearness and conciseness. We recommend the book most strongly, especially to young men, and to those who are daily coming in contact with persons who misunderstand the mission of the Catholic Church in this country.

We may add that the book is edited by Very Rev. J. R. Slattery, who has charge of the negro missions in this country, and that the profits derived from its sale will be devoted to the advancement of that noble work.

CONFERENCES ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By the *Rev. Père de Ravignan, S.J.* pp. 295, 12mo. London : R. Washbourne, New York : Benziger Brothers, 1895.

" The instructions comprised in this little book were addressed by the Rev. Père de Ravignan to the associates of the " *Enfants de Marie*," at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Rue de Varennes, Paris, who were chiefly composed of ladies living in the world, who had formerly been educated under its roof. They were never written down by the reverend father, who, from motives of humility, had a great aversion to seeing his own words in black and white, but were compiled from notes taken during the discourses with secret, loving care by one of his hearers, and subsequently revised and edited in their due order by one to whom every shade of style, every turn of idea, and every habitual form of speech of the illustrious preacher of Notre Dame were familiar. Some of the chapters towards the conclusion of the volume, contain instructions given to religious only, during Lenten and other retreats." The preface to the French edition tells us so much of the history of the book.

It was first published in French in 1858. It was translated by Mrs. Abel Rain, and published in English with a preface by Rev. Father Gordan, of the London Oratory, in 1873. The fifth edition has just come from the press, and this proves that the author's words are living words.

There are twenty-one conferences on fundamental truths, on spiritual exercises, and on certain feasts. They all breathe simplicity and sanctity. The reader can imagine that the holy old man addresses him from the pages of the book, so well has the spirit of the speaker been preserved.

This book will furnish excellent spiritual reading, or material for meditation for any one, but especially for persons belonging to that class to which the instructions were first given. We think it will not be useful for those who intend to address such persons on like occasions, because the words of Father Ravignan would not fit in the mouth of any one except a man of like sanctity, and age, and eloquence. Such combinations are rare.

---

THE INNER LIFE OF FATHER THOMAS BURKE, O. P. By a Dominican Friar of the the English Province. Cloth. 16mo. Pp. 100. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.

The author of this little volume wishes "to put before his readers that side of Father Burke's character which, if it is least known, gives the truer, as well as the higher, idea of the well-known preacher of fifteen years ago."

A life of Father Burke was published within two years after his death; but it was taken up almost entirely with his public career. It did not place before us true pictures of the great preacher's childhood at Galway "full of fun and mischief"; of the young novice's life at Perugia, St. Sabina and Rome; or of the zealous Subdeacon and Prior laboring to resuscitate the struggling English Province. It did not show us the pious priest praying, meditating, and directing souls in the sacred tribunal of penance. But a life of Father Burke which did not picture him in all these characters would be incomplete, and, therefore, the author of the present little volume has taken up his pen. The book is small, brief—it can be read in an hour, and it has been penned by a loving hand. Father Burke's friends on both sides of the Atlantic will be glad to have it.

---

SYNOPSIS TRACTATUS SCHOLASTICI DE DEO UNO. Auctore, *Fernando Aloisio Stentrup, S.J.* Innsbruck: Rauch Brothers. 1895.

This is a 360-page octavo treatise intended to be a text-book for the use of students of theology. The author, who is Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Innsbruck, has already contributed to theological literature a work, "De Verbo Incarnato," in four volumes, two of which are entitled "Christologia" and two "Soteriologia." His experience must have made him familiar with the needs of student and teacher in the lecture room, and his treatise "De Deo Uno," is intended to supply their needs on that subject. Unlike many other authors, Father Stentrup adds to the usual chapters on the subject proper, a section treating "de creatione," "de conservatione," and "de concursu." The book is a storehouse of authorities skilfully brought together, and clearly and concisely explained.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

DIVINE LOVE AND THE LOVE OF GOD'S MOST BLESSED MOTHER. By *Right Rev. F. J. Weld*, Protonotary Apostolic. Received from Benziger Brothers.

A TOUR ROUND MY LIBRARY and Some Other Papers. By *B. B. Comegys* Philadelphia: Geo. S. Ferguson Co. 1893.

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By *Sylvester Joseph Hunter, S. J.* Vol. I. New York: Benziger Brothers.

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XX.—OCTOBER, 1895.—No. 80.

---

## THE EVOLUTION OF EVOLUTION.

**W**E have had many treatises on evolution—the evolution of species, of the solar system, of the sidereal universe, of law, of art, of religious worship, of political organization, of systems of theology, etc., but as yet, so far as the present writer knows, no one has expressly considered “the evolution of evolution itself.”

By this phrase we mean the origin, development, present state and probable future of that system of thought with which the teachings of such men as Herbert Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, Tyn-dall, Karl Pearson and Professor Haeckel have made us all more or less familiar.

The main characteristic of this system is its persistent endeavor to explain all higher energies in terms of lower activities, and so, while denying the possibility of creation without pre-existing material, to affirm the universal origin of all things, with all their powers, from others which avowedly have no such powers to bestow. A second not less noteworthy character is its neglect to seek for or acquire any solid intellectual ground for its own support; so that while it, in fact, bases every power of the universe on impotence, it derives all the highest faculties of the intellect from nescience, and practically proclaims Unreason Lord of the Universe!

Strange, that a system so essentially irrational should have been slowly built up through the efforts, or with the approval, of so many gifted minds, to replace another which once commanded the allegiance of the keenest intellects the world has known! That latter system possessed, indeed, the essential power to retain



mens' allegiance on to our own day, though the effect of personal deficiencies on a succession of events and changed circumstances (which alone could not have caused such an overthrow), made the continuance of its sway impossible.

It seems to us that few investigations could be more interesting than a thorough study of the decay and overthrow of the scholastic philosophy, together with the uprising, in its place, of that modern system which Mr. Arthur Balfour has lately termed "naturalism," with its attendant net-work of skepticism, in the meshes of which Mr. Balfour himself remains helplessly entangled. A few suggestions towards such a study are what we purpose here and now to offer to our readers, with the addition of some notes as to a few scientific facts which seem to indicate that "evolution," in the popular sense of that term, is a theory which has had its day.

If it is strange, as we have said, that such an incoherent system should have replaced one so solid and well laid-together, it is more strange still that evolutionists should regard that replacement with the satisfaction they do. It is as if some graceful mediæval fane, with its slender soaring columns, its traceried windows, its dexterously arranged system of thrusts, lightly but solidly suspending in mid-air a fair groined roof, had fallen down in ruin, and that men having roughly framed an imperfect shelter from its fragments, should chuckle and congratulate themselves thereon, as on a positive architectural progress and improvement! Yet some of our readers may very naturally object that the intellect is not free, but must follow evidence, and, therefore that the earlier system could not have been so excellent as we suppose, since otherwise it must have continued, willy nilly, to command the assent of all, or almost all, capable men.

It is true that the intellect, in the abstract, must follow evidence; but men are by no means all intellect. They are largely dominated by their emotions, and many of them are readily carried away by each successive fashion of the day. Moreover, it is not every one who adheres to a true system who can skilfully show forth its claims upon the assent of others; nor does it even follow that every skilful advocate who is faithful to it as a whole, is sound in every one of his views regarding it. Moreover, there are such defects as sloth, self-seeking, undue subservience to personal influence and neglect of fidelity to old truths under new circumstances.

Certainly the change from the intellectual harmony and completeness of the thirteenth century to the discord and disarray of the sixteenth, is wonderful. It was a transformation, indeed, affecting the whole of life, and most potent in its consequences. But

this change may be paralleled by that which has transformed the domination of the Church as it existed under Innocent III., into the feebleness of the days of Pius VI.

Under the former Pontificate it seemed that ecclesiastical authority could never lose the control which it then possessed over every department of national and social life. In the affairs of every nation, of every city and township, and, indeed, of every family in every land of Christendom, the Church intervened through her sacramental ordinances, her stately ceremonial and her supreme authority. Yet after a very few years the ignominy to which Boniface VIII. was put by the emissaries of Phillipe le Bel, led to his death, while in that pontiff's person the Church underwent a humiliation from which she has never recovered.

This fact is not, of course, to be explained by any real weakening of the Church's spiritual weapons, but by the sloth, self-seeking, undue subservience to personal influence and neglect of fidelity to old truths under new circumstances on the part of some or other of her ministers. Had the bishops of France been staunch in their loyalty to Boniface, had the inferior clergy been ready unhesitatingly to support their bishops in upholding the Pope against the king, in spite of royal violence and persecution and in adherence to that most logical Bull known as "*Unam Sanctam*," the humiliation of the Church would have been delayed for at least another generation. Changes due to the increase of knowledge, culture and refinement would, of course, have inevitably taken place, but we see no reason to think that these could not have been welcomed and provided for without injury to the hierarchical constitution of Christendom, nor that churchmen need have let power slip from their hands as they did.

A parallel case is presented by the overthrow of that metaphysical system known as the Scholastic Philosophy. We see no reason why the inevitable changes in the intellectual order which advancing physical and mental science necessitated, need have caused any philosophical breach of continuity. But such a breach once effected, the circumstances of the age could not but rapidly widen it with fatal efficacy; for never since the origin of the historic period did the leading races of mankind simultaneously experience such a rapid succession of religious, political, intellectual and physical changes as between the end of the fifteenth and the middle of the seventeenth centuries.

The breach itself must be admitted, however reluctantly, to have been largely due to the teachers of the "old learning" in the latter days of its general acceptance. An unwise conservatism and an invincible repugnance to the labor of welding together new truths with old ones, made them neglect those physical sci-

ences which were then freshly budding forth, and rely much on seductive reasoning and great subtlety in verbal distinctions, as if the sphere of the *verbum mentale* could be substantially and greatly enlarged by playing cunning tricks with the *verbum oris*.

Centuries before, that wonderful man, Roger Bacon, had warned the philosophers of his day of their danger, and wisely counselled them to have recourse to experiments and useful observations of facts, instead of relying so largely upon mere processes of ratiocination. In the sixteenth century it was almost too late to arrest the philosophic decay. Fresh discoveries and strikingly novel observations were accumulating on all sides. A new world had been disclosed by Columbus, with races of men and wonderful civilizations, which had remained for centuries unknown, while birds, beasts and reptiles utterly foreign to anything before known were being again and again brought over to Europe. But another discovery was even more important in transforming the intellectual and moral condition of Western Europe. Through the fall of Constantinople men became acquainted with the literature of ancient Greece, and there arose a violent passion for it—a passion which diffused and revived Platonism and prepossessions hostile to the whole Christian system.

A flood of moral corruption deluged Italy and spread to France and Germany, while a contempt for the ideas of the men of the preceding generation—men who had known neither the Transatlantic nor the Hellenic worlds—whose philosophical system must, therefore, they thought, be as inapt and barbarous in its conceptions as the latinity whereby those conceptions were expressed.

Thus, by the combined effects of neglect on the part of professors of the "old learning," and of impatient intolerance on the part of those of the "new," the first breach was effected in the philosophic continuity of Christendom, and the ground became thereby prepared for the germination, or "evolution," of the seeds of that hypothesis of evolution which has culminated before our eyes.

The rich harvest which physical science at once began to yield (as it always yields) to its enthusiastic cultivators very soon enormously widened—as we before hinted—the gulf between the old and the new systems. Yet the students of physics were perfectly right and fully justified in adopting methods and seizing upon truths which had, up to that time, been too much neglected, and it was but natural that success should quickly and greatly augment their enthusiasm. But, unfortunately, while thus seizing upon truths which had been before neglected, they neglected truths—and most fundamental truths—which, up to that time, had been constantly recognized. Not that all, or even the most

conspicuous, devotees of "the new learning" were scientifically successful. Absurd, indeed, has been the admiration and praise bestowed upon that morally meanest of mankind, Bacon, and his "Novum Organum!" For, so little did he recognize or allow the claims of the intellect, and so absurdly servile was he in his mere quest of facts, that his efforts were as barren of results as those of any of the schoolmen upon whom he poured out his very foolish scorn.

The universal and objective validity of those primary and fundamental intuitions which can alone afford a logical foundation for even the lowest physical science, being ignored or repudiated, the gates of human thought were thrown open to admit that long procession of ephemeral follies put forth by successive sophists from Descartes, Locke and Hume, though Kant, Hegel, Schilling and Hartmann, to the Spencers, Huxleys, Tyndalls and Herschels of our own day. Therewith the "evolution of evolution" has run its course and the "unreason" of men has enthusiastically proclaimed the supreme "unreason" of the universe.

That philosophical heresiarch Descartes, the *fons et origo* of the later follies of all the men above named, the great exemplar of all "topsyturveydom" and who based "intuition" on "ratiocination," at once aspired to a mechanical exploration of the universe. To him is due that supreme folly of our own day which teaches (as Professor Huxley has taught) that to let a man know his house is on fire is not the cause of that process of "running home" which he may thereupon set going! That well-meaning, puzzle-headed Englishman, Locke, by reducing all our sources of knowledge to "sensation" and "reflection," supplied everything that was necessary for the development of the "idealism" of Berkeley and his followers to the present day.

But "idealism" is only the other side of the shield of "materialism"; since for neither system is there any source of knowledge beyond "impressions" or "feelings"; and our "sensations" are represented as being "impressions" or "feelings" in their most vivid form.

Therefore beyond these we can (according to these systems) know nothing, and though the piety of Bishop Berkeley led him to regard the universe about him as a phantasmagoria played off by God upon his (Berkeley's) own mind, that acute mocker of his fellows, Hume, saw clearly that from such premises very different conclusions followed. He therefore amused himself, and gained the renown he greedily desired, by drawing forth those consequences and depicting them to the stupid amazement of his contemporaries who took him seriously. Hume saw, clearly enough, that if "impressions" or "feelings" are the ultimate source of all

knowledge and its only trustworthy elements, then not only is God an impossible object of knowledge, but no man can have any knowledge of himself—of the reality of his own existence.

Every "impression," every "feeling," is a single, individual subjective state which cannot tell us anything about the real state of our objective world—not even its existence. Still less possible is it for mere subjective "feelings" to tell us anything about "continuity," "succession," or "causation," or inform us either as to what, if anything, gives rise to "impressions" or what, if anything, experiences them. Yet, strange to say upon such a basis he gratified himself and proved the amazing gullibility of Carlyle's "fools" by pretending to construct a positive system upon two magic words—"association" and "custom." By "association" he signified the tendency of the individual to join together in imagination and expectation successive and simultaneous experiences. By "custom" he denotes a sort of solid or collective "association," by which masses of men came to acquire similar combined impressions and expectations.

Thus it was, he said, that our fleeting impressions are able to suggest to us a permanent and orderly world, and so (he taught) it comes about that our rapid stream of individual feeling, deludes us into a persuasion of our continued personal existence and that the complex impressions we denote by the terms "continuity," "succession" and "cause," have an existence in our consciousness.

It is really impossible to believe that a mind so acute as that of Hume, could have put forward such a system, save with "his tongue in his cheek"—"association" carried on by what cannot associate because it has no being, and "custom" experienced by a society which has no existence either as a whole or in its component elements—we having no more intuition of the existence of either than we have of the existence of God! Hume, in whatever corner of the universe he may now be, must surely enjoy—amongst other modes of motion—a self-complacent chuckle over Professor Huxley's little book about him and the solemnity with which his *jeux d'esprit* are seriously commended to the admiration and imitation of the professor's contemporaries.

But "association" has played a very important part in the evolution of evolution. That feelings, sense-experiences, emotions and ideas which have existed simultaneously or in succession do tend to become associated is, of course, an unquestionable fact, and the English sensists (culminating in John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer), have made use thereof to explain the genesis of our ideas from sensations and to attempt to show how human self-conscious intellect may have been evolved from the psychical

faculties of a lower animal. "*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*" is the motto of the whole school; and, taken in a certain sense, the dictum is good and true. For it is a necessary consequence of our combined bodily and mental constitution, that no idea can be present to our minds save by the aid of some mental image present to the imagination and we can imagine nothing of which we have not previously had some sensuous experience.

Hence the mistake made by those who think that no conception can be true unless it can be "mentally visualized" by us. This is, of course, really a great mistake, because it amounts to a denial of the distinctness of our ideas (such as those of "existence," "non-existence," "absolute being," "possible being," "truth," "necessity," etc.) from our feelings.

But though "feelings" and "mental images" are necessary antecedents and accompaniments of our ideas, they are so essentially distinct from the latter<sup>1</sup> that the dictum "*Nihil in intellectu quod nunquam fuerit in sensu*," is no less true than the former adage. These dicta are indeed complementary truths, the acceptance of both of which is necessary for a right understanding of human reason, which is intellect energizing in and subserved by a material, corporeal power.

Confusion between imagination and conception is one of the commonest of modern errors, and is one through which alone "the evolution of evolution" has been possible. A clear perception of the essential distinctness which exists between these two faculties is the first requisite for a sound psychology. But not only did this fatal confusion impair a due recognition of the claims of reason by men of the "impressionist" school, any such recognition was made impossible for them by their denial of (1) our powers of apprehending universal and necessary truths, (2) of knowing with certainty our own continuous, and (3) generally of apprehending all objective, existence;<sup>2</sup> it being assumed that human knowledge is rigidly confined to "sensations" and "sense-impressions," and is essentially "relative," and therefore necessarily divergent from the realities of things as they exist for any super-human intelligence.

Even Kant, who sought to affirm against Hume the validity of pure reason, and by his categorical imperative seemed to assert, in the most forcible manner, the objectivity of ethics, really re-

<sup>1</sup> It is impossible for us here to enter upon any exposition of these truths. We must be content to refer our readers to our work *On Truth*, pp. 111 and 112 and from 178 to 223.

<sup>2</sup> We have no space for any defence of these institutions here, but would refer our readers to the article entitled "Professing Themselves to be Wise, They Became Fools," in the A. C. Q. R. for April, 1891.

mained bound in the chains of subjectivism, since our highest and seemingly most certain perceptions were but the outcome of human, conditioning "forms of thought."

Sir William Hamilton was long regarded as a successful opponent of skeptical and sensuous philosophy, and yet his doctrine of "the relativity of knowledge" opened the door to yet more vigorous and successful assertions of evolutionary mental philosophy, a most complete exposition of which is to be found in the pages of Mr. Herbert Spencer.

The possibility of mental evolution (of intellect from sense) having been made first conceivable, then possible, and finally (in their own eyes) certain, by these successors of Locke, it only remained—in order that the modern doctrine of evolution should gain acceptance—to show that corporeal evolution might be accepted also.

The progress of biological science during the eighteenth century had prepared men's minds, by the new views it had opened up, for yet more startling suggestions. Buffon (1707–1788) was especially remarkable for the hypotheses he emitted about the origin of the earth, the nature of generation, and the relation between the animals of the old world and those of the new. Kant and Goethe, as well as Buffon, put forth ideas respecting the transformation of species, while Lamarck, in the very beginning of this century, distinctly promulgated the doctrine of the origin of new species from pre-existing ones through the influence of surrounding circumstances. His views gained small acceptance, and then fell into utter discredit, yet of late they have obtained many adherents, especially in the United States.

But the really influential conception, the emission of which was to act as a spark on a mass of stored-up gunpowder, could never have been formed but for the excellent labors of successive naturalists, who little foresaw the future, startling outcome of their toils.

Thus it was Linnæus who, in 1735 and 1758, set forth the first practical system of biological classification, and originated a convenient system of nomenclature without which it would be very difficult to acquire, and quite impossible to retain in mind, a knowledge of any very numerous set of objects. The careful definitions of Buffon's collaborator, Daubenton, and the untiring industry of John Hunter, accumulated treasures of anatomical and physiological knowledge; but it was Cuvier, above all, who, by his indefatigable labors in investigating the structure of animals, living and extinct, prepared the necessary materials for the theory which was to come. Not less important was the circumstance that Werner, Hutton, and others had shown the earth's

crust to consist partly of stratified and partly of unstratified rocks, and that William Smith (the father of English geology) demonstrated the existence of definite and uniform relations between different strata and the fossils they respectively contained.

Subsequently, the labors of John Müller, in Germany, and Richard Owen, in England, were most fruitful of results, and by degrees it became known that:

1. Different geographical areas are inhabited by different organisms.
2. There is a relation and affinity between the past and present inhabitants of each such area.
3. There is a certain resemblance between fossil forms of more or less antiquity and some immature stages of existing living beings.
4. There is often more or less similitude between the earlier stages of existence of many living animals and the adult condition of other living animals belonging to lower forms of life.

Evidently, these facts favored the notion that the latest forms of life had grown out of preceding ones, and the view that new species of animals and plants had been produced through the operation of some obscure and hitherto undiscovered laws, became widely accepted amongst the most eminent naturalists. Such a view, for example, was not only maintained by the late Sir Richard Owen, but he declared that the discovery of such a law was possibly the chief end which the best anatomists and physiologists had in view.

Some theory of "Evolution" was thus evidently soon to be "evolved." But what theory? The theory of evolution which has become so widespread and popular, and forms a part of what Mr. Balfour calls "naturalism," advocates an "evolution" of one kind. But there is another, and a very different theory of evolution, which we are persuaded is destined to supplant the former, and we believe there are abundant signs that it is destined to do so at no distant day. The popular form of evolution is non-theistic; that which we believe will, rather sooner than later, supplant it is Theistic evolution.

Any rational theory of evolution must consider the world as a whole. It must, therefore, include man, and take into account his higher no less than his lower faculties. It must account for what we regard as our perception of necessary truth; our self-conscious knowledge of our own continuous existence, and our perceptions of truth and goodness—of right and wrong.

For all men who are convinced they have such higher faculties, any theory of evolution which ignores them must be absurd. That reason, as we know it in consciousness, is the outcome



of the mere play of physical forces, is a doctrine which has but to be stated to such men in order to be self-condemned. But to those who, as we have seen, ignore the essential characters of their own intellect, regard their ideas but as modifications of past sensations, and declare virtue to be but one form of pleasure; unreasoning evolution presents no such contradiction.

Without seeking to ascertain the reason why, we may be quite sure of the fact, that many men have greatly desired to be able to conceive of the universe as free from any Supreme Intelligence or All-powerful will. Rather than admit the evident existence of such, they would, if they could, have passionately repudiated all evidence of design in nature, and eagerly proclaimed Unreason to be Lord of the Universe.

But so to do, was long impossible. The evidences of design in nature were too plainly to be read in the facts of animal structure; in the accord between organization and function; and in the marvellous phenomena of instinct. That the activities of organic life could ever be explained (as Descartes had suggested) by the mere motions of a cunningly contrived mechanism, was beyond all belief. Kant held it to be absurd even to think that any naturalist would ever arise who should be capable of explaining so much as the growth of a blade of grass mechanically.

But at last the hour of the cosmic clock struck; the man appeared; and soon, Darwin's hypothesis of the origin of species by "natural selection" was promulgated. Thereby, the advocates of mechanism obtained full satisfaction; the difficulties which beset the adorers of the god "Unreason," seemed to be removed, for not only mental but also corporeal transformation appeared most simply explicable. Such transformism, in its most popular and pernicious sense, was welcomed; and the world witnessed a new mental birth, "the evolution of evolution."

A mechanical explanation of nature, for those who desired it, really seemed to have become possible. By "natural selection" the most wonderful adaptation of structure, and the most divergent peculiarities of organization could, it appeared, all be explained by the conservation in the struggle for life of minute fortuitous variations transmitted to offspring. The situation became thus completely changed; the idea of "design" or "purpose" seemed at once to have become superfluous, and Hæckel coined a special word (*Dystele-ology*) to denote a science of aimlessness in nature.

The new hypothesis struck the most dangerous blow at Theism which any living man has witnessed, and its success was great. For "natural selection" seemed to make all so easy and obvious; and it soon grew, therefore, to be as attractive to the

multitude as its deification of mechanism and chance caused it to be enthusiastically welcomed by anti-theistic philosophers.

As to how it is now welcomed, and what is the present position of the popular theory of evolution, we will say a few words later on, but before doing so we desire to call attention to one very notable instance of its rejection.

When Darwin and Wallace promulgated their theory of "natural selection," the greatest of English anatomists and natural philosophers, Sir Richard Owen, did not welcome it. He was a believer in what he called the "ordained becoming" of new species by appointed "secondary laws," and was an advocate of rational, that is, theistic evolution. He declared<sup>1</sup> that species change "by virtue of inherent tendencies" thereto, affirming that such a succession of species by continuously operating law is not a blind operation, but rather intimates "a preconceived progress," and that such evolution, proceeding "towards a foreseen goal," shows in its "broad features" the unmistakable impress of Divine volition. He passed away from us with his mind unchanged in his views as to evolution and it can now be said that the greatest English comparative anatomist of this century has, after a consideration of the hypothesis for more than the duration of an entire generation, continuously and finally rejected it. This we believe is the greatest fact of our venerable anatomist's whole life and teaching. For this firmness and consistency he had for a time to endure the ordeal of disesteem and contumely from not a few anti-theistic men of science. But, as has been the case in previous instances, that which his contemporaries least appreciated may, we believe will, hereafter largely add to his fame, if it does not even constitute his greatest glory.

The opposite state of mind is most clearly exemplified by the noteworthy European naturalists, Professors Weismann and Haeckel. Their dicta will enable our readers to understand what is the present state of the Darwinian theory and to what a degree of absurd dogmatism that theory of evolution has been evolved.

That there is a Providence which "shapes our ends," and that the universe is replete with purpose, are in the eyes of Professor Weismann errors so fundamental, that any asserted facts which imply them, are thereby, *ipso facto*, demonstrated not to be really facts, but fictions. That the cosmos is ruled by unreason seems to be an article *stantis val labentis ecclesiæ*. Therefore when he finds that the effective action of "natural selection" in the origin of species, not only cannot be proved but that there are facts which positively conflict with it, the consequence is that "it is so

<sup>1</sup> See his *Anatomy of Vertebrates*, vol. iii., p. 808 *et seq.*

much the worse for the facts." He tells us expressly that facts of this kind cannot really exist, since efficiency of "natural selection" is a truth demonstrated by a process of *reductio ad absurdum*.

Had we not absolute certainty thereof, we could not be sure that there is no design in the universe or deny the possibility that through the phenomena of nature "an increasing purpose runs."

He has said:<sup>1</sup> "It is really very difficult to comprehend the process of natural selection in its details; and to this day it is impossible to demonstrate it in any one point. . . . We accept it not because we are able to demonstrate the process in detail . . . but simply because we must, because it is the only possible explanation that we can conceive. . . . It alone can explain the adaptation of organisms without assuming the help of a principle of design . . . it is inconceivable that there could be yet another capable of explaining the adaptation of organisms without assuming the help of a principle of design."

Professor Haeckel has recently delivered himself of what he calls a "confession of faith"<sup>2</sup> which is even more noteworthy. His dogmatism and self-conceit combined, have afforded us the most amusing piece of reading that we have enjoyed for a very long time.

The following passage is an example of his readiness to lay down the law absolutely and at once, about matters concerning which the ablest physicists profess themselves to be tentative inquirers. He says<sup>3</sup> with regard to evolution, "from primeval chaos to the present order of the cosmos."

"At the outset there is nothing in infinite space but mobile elastic ether and innumerable separate particles—the primitive atoms—scattered throughout it in the form of dust."

Those "primitive atoms" are no mysteries to him for he has evidently had them in his laboratory and overhauled them carefully.

Thus it is that he is able to describe them so fully to us<sup>4</sup> as being of a definite magnitude and spherical in shape. He has ascertained—no doubt by a series of careful experiments—that they are "inelastic," "impenetrable" and "indivisible," and, *mirabile dictu*, "inert." Yet in spite of this inertia they have a tendency to unite in small, definite groups, which groups upon careful examination, he found, turned out to be those "identical atoms" which so few physicists before Haeckel had been able to isolate, still less to build up. These chemical atoms showed, of course, their special

<sup>1</sup> See *Contemporary Review*, No. 333, September, 1893. Pp. 322-337. The italics are ours.

<sup>2</sup> *Mouism as Connecting Religion and Science*. Translated by J. Gilchrist, London, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> P. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 26-27.

properties, and the Professor does not seem to have rested till he found out that these properties had a cause, that it was but one cause and what that one cause was. These atoms he declares to be "*solely* conditioned by the varying number and disposition of the similar primitive atoms of which they are composed." It is to be regretted that Professor Hæckel has not given any diagrams of the arrangement of these "primitive atoms" in, say, "an atom of carbon" or an "atom of oxygen."

Having thus penetrated into the most intimate constitution and surveyed the origin, from "*the outset*," of the inorganic world, we need not wonder that the mystery of the coming of life and of the first origin of organization and growth have been easily mastered by him. The history thereof he gives, somewhat too briefly, as follows:

"After the glowing sphere of the earth has cooled down to a certain degree, drops of fluid water precipitate themselves on the hardened crust of its surface—the first primary condition of organic life. Carbon atoms begin their *organism—engendering* activity, and unite with the other elements into plasma combinations *capable of growing*. One small plasma-group oversteps the limits of cohesion and individual growth; it falls asunder into two similar halves. With this movement *begin organic life* and its most distinctive function, heredity."

This appears to have been listened to with admiration by the meeting of naturalists at Altenburg to whom it was addressed. A profane person, however, has characterized it as one of the most barefaced efforts ever attempted to disguise hopeless ignorance by empty verbal combinations. But even such wonderful discoveries as the ultimate constitution of matter and the origin of life and organization by no means satisfy our professor, whose motto should certainly be "*Excelsior!*" "From this successfully scaled height of knowledge," he triumphantly exclaims,<sup>1</sup> "there open up before our joyously quickened spirit of research and discovery, new and surprising prospects, which promise to bring us still nearer to the solution of the one great riddle of the world."

Nothing remains hidden from the gaze of so physically inspired a prophet. Like a Neo-Platonist of Alexandria he has, while yet living, attained to a direct and immediate vision of the deity, manifested, however, in a somewhat peculiar shrine, namely, under the bell jar of an air pump? The light therein visible is a sort of Shekinah, for he tells<sup>2</sup> that in that "it is the vibrating ether we see," while the ether is nothing less than "God the creator, always in motion." We can regard it—the cosmic ether—he proclaims)

<sup>1</sup> P. 25.

<sup>2</sup> P. 24.

as all comprehending divinity, and upon this found the thesis, "Belief in God is reconcilable with science."

Let us now turn to briefly note the essential characteristics of the rational, theistic theory of evolution, and especially note the differences which exist between its conception of the inner nature and properties of the organic world and that of the Darwinian conception. According to the theistic conception of evolution it is the outcome and manifestation of powers, principles and laws impressed on the material universe in the first instant of its creation. If species change they change by virtue of inherent tendencies, their conception being the manifestation of a preconceived progress which takes place not blindly or by chance, but by continuously operating law towards a foreseen goal.

The Darwinian view, the view of "naturalism," is very different. According to it (and this is its greatest fault) no inherent tendencies, no innate laws, govern either individual development or the evolution of new species. All is due to the chance action of small congenital variations, each such variation being itself accidental, the whole beauty and order of organic life, though, of course, determined by invariable unconditional antecedents, being but the merest outcome of the merest chance."

If such is really the case, then living organisms offer indeed a singular contrast to non-living inorganic nature. There at least we perceive that every so-called element, every chemical compound, every crystal and every non-crystalline inorganic body has its own innate powers and properties, and is subject to specific laws from which it never deviates. Such bodies act in many ways on one another, but in every such action the reaction of the body acted on takes place strictly according to its own innate laws and endowments.

Among the most recent valuable works of science which controvert this system and give good evidence against it, is one by Mr. William Bateson.<sup>1</sup> He strongly supports that view which would forbid us to regard the world of living beings as any less governed by innate laws than is the inorganic world.

Granting, for argument's sake, that new species have arisen through variation, his work is devoted to examining the question whether such variations are indefinite and minute, so that if the whole series of them could be seen they would appear "continuous," or whether such a view of them would imply sudden and considerable changes—so that the variations would seem evidently "discontinuous."

This discontinuity may be as plainly and unmistakably mani-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Materials for the Study of Organic Organization*, London, 1894.

fested in the most minute structures as in all large ones, and Mr. Bateson's volume is principally occupied about cases of bodily symmetry whether normal or abnormal.

One minor form of symmetry is that which determines the patterns which may be formed, whether upon large surfaces of large organisms, or on the most minute structures. It certainly does appear to us that the evolution of many of these patterns constitutes a difficulty for naturalism which is none the less great because it has been so generally overlooked.

As to this Mr. Bateson says:<sup>1</sup>

"If any one will take into his hand some complex piece of living structure, a passion flower, a peacock's feather, a cockle-shell, or the like, and will ask himself how that came to be so, the part of the answer that he will find it hardest to give, is that which relates to the perfection of its pattern. And it is not only in these large and tangible structures that this question arises, for the same challenge is presented in the most minute and seemingly trifling details. In the skeleton of a diatom or of a radiolarian, the scale of a butterfly, the sculpture on a pollen-grain or an egg-shell, in the wreaths and stars of nuclear division, such patterns again and again recur, and again and again the question of their significance goes unanswered. There are many suggestions, some plausible enough, as to why the tail of a peacock is gaudy, why the coat of a pollen-grain should be rough, and so forth, but the significance of pattern is untouched by these. Nevertheless, repetitions arranged in pattern exist throughout organized nature, in creatures that move and in those that are fixed, in the great and in the small, in the seen and in the hidden, within and without, as a property or attribute of life, scarcely less universal than the function of respiration or metabolism itself."

One of the most obvious characters presented by our body, and by the bodies of all the animals most familiar to us, is that each has a right and a left side, and that these two sides, and their parts, correspond, as our right hand proverbially resembles our left one. When deeply considered, this fact is by itself sufficient to prove that the body of an animal has its own innate laws which regulate its development, for this kind of correspondence—technically called "*bilateral symmetry*"—shows itself not only in these familiar conditions, but in the results of disease, and in very peculiar structures found in exceptional animals of special kinds. Indeed, on the hypothesis that a blood-relationship of descent binds together different animals, nature actually forces upon us the perception that new and more intense forms of bilateral symmetry have arisen in comparatively recent geological time.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 21.

Thus naturalists now generally agree that birds have descended from reptiles, but the very diverse bilateral symmetry which exists between the two wings of birds for the one part, and between their two legs on the other part, is far more striking than any which is to be found in their hypothetical progenitors.

Mr. Bateson supplies us with numerous instances of similar and simultaneous bilateral variations.

Another form of symmetry is known as "*serial symmetry*." Such symmetry is most plainly seen in the successively similar segments and pairs of limbs in the centipede and its allies, but it is also to be traced in the structure of the human chest, with its successive ribs, and the series of bones (called *vertebræ*), which comprise our spinal column, or backbone, and in the resemblances which can be traced between the arm and the leg, and between the hand and the foot.

Mr. Bateson in his third chapter<sup>1</sup> gives many examples of sudden variation in parts which are serially symmetrical.

In man and beasts the bones (*vertebræ*) which exist in the neck are normally seven; and this is so whether the neck is enormously elongated, as in the giraffe, or exceptionally short, as in the whale or mole. The only exceptions to this rule are the manatee, which has but six, and the sloth, in which there may be as few as six, or as many as ten cervical *vertebræ*. In the human subject the last bone of the neck, which normally is entirely devoid of movable ribs, sometimes possesses them. Fifty-seven such cases are cited by Mr. Bateson, and it is interesting to note that in forty-two of these instances the ribs were present on both sides.

Variations are sometimes found in the number of *vertebræ* existing in successive regions of the spinal column, there being sometimes, for example, thirteen instead of twelve in the chest; four, five or six in the lumbar region, etc. To ascertain the exact correspondence between bones which thus differ in different individuals and species, has been a curious subject of inquiry among naturalists. Similarly, there are singular divergences, with occasional individual variations, in the number of bones which make up the wrist or ankle of different animals, and much ingenuity has been expended in trying to determine what are the precise correspondences in different cases of this kind. Mr. Bateson (we think with much reason), regards this quest, in the way it is often pursued, as but a vain one. Though nature's methods are simple, he urges, yet her simplicity is not ours. We are too apt in this matter to run into anthropomorphism, and allow ourselves to "fancy that nature has produced the forms of life from each other in the ways which we should have used if we had been asked to do it. If a man were

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 102-128.

asked to make a wax model of the skeleton of one animal from a wax model of the skeleton of another, he would, perhaps, set about it by making small additions to and subtractions from its several parts; but the natural process differs in one great essential from this, for in nature the body of one individual has never been the body of its parent, and is not formed by a plastic operation from it; but the new body is made again new from the beginning, just as if the model had gone back into a melting pot before the wax model was begun.

The author just cited also describes a multitude of instances of discontinuous variations in animals of the most varied and diverse classes. These variations have been detected in both external and internal bodily structures of the most varied kinds. They relate to variations of dentition, to the number and situation of mammary glands, to peculiarities of arterial distribution and modifications in the ducts of important glands—such as the kidneys, to the eyes of insects and shell-fish, to insects' wings, the bones of ruminants, and especially in peculiarities of the digits (fingers and toes) of many animals.

The facts described by Mr. Bateson seem to us sufficient to prove the very frequent occurrence of discontinuous variation. To the consequent probability that new species have been evolved by the help of such, it has been objected, notably by Dr. A. R. Wallace, that his ample catalogue is a catalogue of monstrosities. Every one, as has been urged, knew that monstrosities from time to time occurred, but a new species—necessarily a symmetrical and well-organized form—could never have owed its origin to a mere monstrosity, such as a cat with two heads, a beast with superfluous or deficient digits, with half, or with double, the number of its proper supply of teeth, etc.

This criticism, however, is both unfair and exceedingly shallow. It is unfair because true as it is that we all know of the occurrence of monstrosities, very few of us know of the great frequency and enormous numbers of such variations as those Mr. Bateson notices. Besides this, any candid peruser of the book criticized must see that its author is perfectly well aware of the monstrous character of many of the varieties described by him, and has no intention of presenting such forms as the probable, or even possible, origin of new species. It is still further unfair, because a certain number of the variations described are perfectly harmonious and symmetrical changes, and can no more be said to be "monstrosities" than a tiger can be said to be a "monster" because it has not the mane of a lion, or a lion a "monster" because it has not the stripes of a tiger.

The hostile criticism is also very shallow; for what, after all, is



the real nature of many of the variations recorded by Mr. Bateson which may be said to be "monstrosities?" They are orderly and perfect structures *in themselves*, and by that very fact show that the organic world is *not* that inert mass of matter devoid of innate law Darwinism supposes, but is orderly in even its very aberrations from normal type. Mr. Bateson, among such instances, describes and figures a variation which has been observed in a saw-fly, in which the end of an antenna had taken on the form of a perfectly well-formed foot; also a beetle, of the genus *Carabus*, in which one limb was replaced by a pair of legs, each of which was perfect and normal in the details of its structure, with a number of other similar instances. In all these cases the details of the structures are orderly and quite different from the indefinite, fortuitous phenomena which we should expect to find in changes produced by external influences on bodies not capable of self-regulation by internal laws.

But among the mass of instances described there are some which are altogether harmonious and symmetrical discontinuous variations.

Yet, did we know of one case which was truly and unmistakably of that kind, that alone would suffice to make it probable that if new species arise by variation at all, such discontinuous variation is the kind of variation which has been efficient in their production.

One change of the kind, is that which occasionally so affects the feathers of birds, such, *e.g.*, as the moorhen, as to make them resemble the plumage of the apteryx and the cassowary. Such a variation amongst poultry produces the forms known as the "silky-fowls," sometimes called "emeu-fowls," which are capable of perpetuation by breeding.

The long-haired varieties of goats, cats, and rabbits, are familiar enough; but it is less generally known that a similar variation exists in what are called "Peruvian guinea-pigs." Mr. Bateson mentions the capture of a common mouse with long black, silk-like hair, which, he adds, is specially "interesting, as showing that such a total variation may occur as a definite phenomenon without selection."

On the other hand, varieties have occurred which were entirely naked, but had a wrinkled condition of skin, and they produced young which were similar to their parents.

Now, in south Africa two creatures belonging to the same natural order as the mouse, are of about the size of a mouse, and have a burrowing habit. They are normally and naturally naked, with a wrinkled skin. If new species have arisen by variation, why should not these African animals have arisen by a sudden

discontinuous variation, such as that, we know, may occur in the case of the common mouse?

Groups of plants are often characterized by having the parts which make up the flower in fives, or fours, or threes, as the case may be.

The tulips belong to a group having the parts or organs of its flower in multiples of three. Mr. Bateson gives an interesting example of a tulip having all the parts of its flower in fours. This variation, as he says, "is a large and decided one; but, it is more than this; it is not only large, it is *complete*. The resulting form possesses the character of division into four no less completely and perfectly than its parent possessed the character of division into three. The change from three to four is thus perfected: from the form with perfect division into three is sprung a form of perfect division into four. This is a case of a *total* or *perfect* variation." Obviously, the perfection and symmetry of this remarkable tulip could have been in no way due to "natural selection." Why, then, should the tulips with their parts in three have owed that condition to "natural selection?"

One of the most curious parts of animal structure is the difference which exists between the build of all the American apes on the one hand, and those of the old world on the other. One of these differences is that between the number of bicuspid molars—grinding teeth—which have milk predecessors. In man, and all monkeys of the old world, there are only two on either side of each jaw, but in all the monkeys of the new world there are three such.

Mr. Bateson describes and figures the skull of an American spider monkey, in which there are four such teeth on each side of the upper jaw. All these are equally well formed, so that it is impossible to say that any one of them is supernumerary rather than another. Thus, it is demonstrated that a new and perfect form of dentition—an emphatically discontinuous variation—may suddenly arise.

Another most striking divergence of structure is that which exists between beasts (such as oxen, goats, deer, llamas, swine, and the hippopotamus), in which the number of toes used in locomotion is even—two or four—and those of other beasts (such as horses, asses, tapirs, and rhinoceroses), in which the number is odd—one or three.

In the even-toed group, the line of symmetry passes down in the middle between the two toes, while in the odd-toed group it passes down along the middle of the single toe (horse and ass) or along the middle of the middle toe of three (tapir and rhinoceros).

But a very exceptional variation is noted by Mr. Bateson. It

is that found in the foot of a horse, in which, instead of a single digit there are two perfectly complete ones each bearing a hoof, while the line of symmetry tapers down *between them*.

Altogether the phenomena recorded in Mr. Bateson's book seem to us amply sufficient, by themselves alone, to deal a death blow to the otherwise absurd and childish theory that species owe their origin to a process of "natural selection."

But though natural selection is the crown and culmination of the "naturalistic"—non-theistic theory of evolution, we think it desirable to also say a few words respecting Mr. Darwin's ancillary theory of "sexual selection."

According to that notion all the special characteristics of the male sex in each species—all that to us seems beautiful, bizarre or revolting (strength and nimbleness apart)—have been evolved by means of the constantly recurring exercise of the female, of her power of choice, amongst contending suitors determined by æsthetic considerations only.

How largely mere fancy may color not only the readings but the very observations of some persons appears to us to be remarkably well shown by an account given by a Mr. and Mrs. Peckham, of their observations respecting "sexual selection in spiders."

They describe the male as courting the female by dancing, during which he displayed to her his attractive first pair of legs, of a delicate green fringed with white, in various odd positions. The effect was remarkable, for we are told she "eyed him intently," appearing much "interested in his performance" and finally encouraged him by "gazing in a softer mood"; surely these spider's "sheep's eyes" are very noteworthy.

Yet his apparent success could not free him from all anxiety, as she would sometimes "make a sudden dash at him," a process which (seeing that the female is always larger and more powerful than her wooer), had a suspicious flavor of cannibalism about it. Indeed the female spider, "*Etiam in amoribus sæva*," is but too apt to bite and suck dry even her accepted spouse. Surely a very remarkable "post-nuptial" settlement.

We find it simply impossible to believe that the brilliant local coloration which certain old-world apes possess could have been due to æsthetic sentiments on the part of female apes and baboons, when we call to mind what are their psychical characteristics and what the physical powers of their would-be spouses.

To produce such effects, the females of each species must have a taste in color as different as constant, while a multitude of remarkable or brilliant phenomena of color are found in parts which can never meet the eye during life.

One of the oddest of the many odd notions set afloat was that promulgated by Mr. Darwin himself—the notion, namely, that it has been feminine influence which has by degrees, as century succeeded century, gradually denuded our backs of the hair with which it was at first so copiously clothed. Now it is evident that the primitive ladies of the Kalmuck and Persian nationalities differed widely in their sentiments as regards the beard; but nevertheless (if the theory is true), the females of every tribe and nation of mankind—in spite of the frequent mutations of fashion—must have unanimously and persistently agreed in abhorring hirsute shoulders, and this though their immediate pithecoïd ancestors entertained a directly opposite sentiment.

But the absurdity of “sexual selection” is now generally recognized and that of “natural selection” as the cause<sup>1</sup> of the origin of species, is being recognized more and more widely. The work of Mr. Bateson and another one by Mr. Frank E. Beddard, F.R.S.,<sup>2</sup> are strong indications that the tide is turning as regards non-theistic evolution, that it has culminated and the process of descent begun. Great has been the part played in the evolution of evolution by the cell-theory—a theory of great value when not pushed to the length it has been. Mr. C. O. Whitman of the United States now deliberately maintains and with very solid arguments, “the inadequacy of the whole cell theory” and has shown (as we long ago affirmed), that the difference between organisms formed of one cell and others formed of many cells, has been enormously exaggerated.

The popular Darwinian doctrines that the coloration of animals is due (1) to their resemblance to their environment, or (2) to their resemblance to some other animal dreaded on account of its dangerous properties, or (3) its nauseous taste, are all carefully considered and satisfactorily disposed of by Mr. Beddard.

But a belief in non-theistic evolution can never be satisfactorily banished by physical science alone. To effect that, it is necessary to revive and disseminate far and wide some philosophical conceptions, especially their bearing upon the question as to the origin of species.

Considerable or small gaps between the various kinds of living creatures are manifest on all sides. The existing creation is plainly discontinuous. The facts as to continuity and discontinuity of variations, of successive forms of life and of surrounding conditions, are matters which demand most careful investiga-

<sup>1</sup> Of course, natural selection must exist and act. If twins are born and one of them happens to be devoid of brain, the other must alone survive—i.e., naturally selected.

<sup>2</sup> *Animal Coloration*, London, 1892.

tion ; and investigations of the kind, such as have here been noticed, demand our gratitude.

But what hope is there of any student of nature arriving at the truth as to the continuity or discontinuity of specific origins, if he has not a clear comprehension of the great facts of discontinuity which are, on all sides, open to his mental gaze ?

There is, in the first place, the chasm which exists between everything which lives and all that is devoid of life. Granting that the universe may have been so formed that on the occurrence of the preordained conditions life, previously created *in potentia*, should suddenly manifest itself "in act," that does not in the least invalidate the deep significance of the fact that for all our experience no life arises save from what already lives.

Secondly, there is the chasm between everything which feels and all that is devoid of sensation. Every one must admit that this chasm exists—every one who is not prepared to affirm that his paper and his pen feel each other.

Far greater, however, is the chasm which exists between every being capable of self-consciousness and a knowledge (however imperfect) of truth, goodness, and beauty, and every being devoid of self-conscious life.

The advocacy of these great truths is, at last, beginning to be patiently listened to, which is no small gain ; and a rational physical kind of agnosticism will ere long take the place of that system which professes to understand science, but to have no knowledge of truths without which all science is absolutely, logically impossible.

The true nature of the organic world, the innate properties of what we call "elements," and the diverse qualities of the substances resulting from their union, alike defy explanation by a non-theistic theory of evolution.

The origin of life, the first thrill of sensation, and the dawn of conscious intelligence, as well as the first perception of good and evil, not only remain as inscrutable as ever, but the many recent attempts made to obtain an explanation of them have only served to bring out more conspicuously their profound inscrutability. The ultimate constitution of matter, the origin and nature of vitality, feeling, and consciousness, as well as the intimate processes of life, growth, and reproduction, all these causes of the origin of species will, we believe, persistently remain quite inexplicable, though science will ever be fruitfully employed in elucidating more and more the means and processes of vital activity and organic change. The mystery of instinct, in spite of all the efforts of Darwin and his disciples, remains absolutely insoluble, and, instead of being capable of explanation by any other organic ac-

tions, vital activities—such as those of growth, repair of injuries, reproduction of lost parts, the development of the embryo, and new kinds of animal life—are rather to be regarded as essentially belonging to its own category.

The repair of its broken net by the spider, the instinctive casting off by a crab of a mutilated limb just at that point whence its renovation can take place, the arrangement by an insect of conditions suitable not for its own life but for the welfare of a progeny it will never see—each and all belong fundamentally to the same group of activities as do processes of organic repair and embryonic development. He who can fully understand instinct would (as we pointed out in the pages of this REVIEW in the year 1881) possess a key capable of unlocking all the mysteries of organic nature.

We may now in conclusion briefly state, by way of resumé, what we deem the essential facts of the “evolution of evolution,” what was the origin, development of that hypothesis, what is its present state, and what we deem will be its fate in a more or less distant future.

“Evolution” as popularly understood, the evolution of “naturalism,” of Spencer and of Darwin—the non-theistic system of evolution—was born in original sin, since its very name is a fraud, nay, rather a robbery! Its name gives the lie to its own conception, while it truly harmonizes with its very contradictory, namely, that system of theistic evolution to which we are confident it will sooner or later give place. For no process of “evolution” is possible unless there has been an antecedent process of “involution.” The development of a germ, of a banyan tree from a seed; of a whole from a minute ovum; of a complex political organization from mere tribal customs; of all the arts from their veriest rudiments, and of the perfected “love” of God from initial tremors of his “fear”; can one and all be readily accepted as credible and reasonable because in each and every case the ultimate outcome existed *in potentia* from the first.

But what thirst can be quenched from an empty cup? What nourishment for mankind is to be raised from a field into which no seed has been ever cast?

The irrationality of its very name presided over its birth and origin, since it was begotten by junction of a system which did not even aspire to anything beyond sensation and imagination, with another absolutely suicidal, since it rejected that rational foundation upon which alone every logical system must be based.

But though here, as at the outset of this article, we lament the destruction of scholasticism and the advent of the sensationalism of Locke and the follies of Bacon and Descartes, we should be

very sorry to be taken for a mere reactionary, whether in science, politics or religion. All attempts at restorations have invariably been failures, and as we have thus every reason to deem them impossible, we may well also believe that they are contrary to God's will.

Yet, although scholasticism can never be revived, its essential truths may be successfully advocated after having been assimilated by the modern mind and reproduced in modes possible for modern acceptance, as the Constitution of the United States enshrines the political principles maintained by St. Thomas Aquinas.

As we have depicted, the decay of pure philosophy coinciding with the rise of merely physical science, prepared the way for the theory of non-theistic evolution, and rendered its conception, birth and nutrition possible.

Culminating with the advent of Darwinism, it has now reigned over the modern scientific world—not without noteworthy protests—for a full generation.

Its present state, however, is one of incipient decay. It is honeycombed with doubts and difficulties, and the number of those who recognize that our ethical intentions alone are, as we long ago pointed out,<sup>1</sup> absolutely fatal to it, is ever on the increase. But fresh discoveries in embryology, the repeated cutting down of phylogenetic trees, new views (such as those we have referred to) about the nature of cells and cell-structure are continually giving rise to conceptions which, from the Darwinian point of view, are heresies, though the heretics may be (and, as yet, generally are) the adherents of the non-rational theory of evolution.

But physiological progress is notably forming a fresh soil suitable for the growth of very different philosophical views from those which belong to "Naturalism." Notably, a new vitalism has been evolved by the recognition of the essential peculiarity of the activities of living organisms, for which mere physics and chemistry have been shown as utterly unable to account. Similarly, it is becoming more and more obvious and undeniable that a living creature is a unity—a unity of force no less than of bodily form. The existence of some immaterial principle of individuation in each animal and plant is more and more plainly indicated, and thus the truth of Aristotle's doctrine on the subject (which we believe will never be bettered) is becoming more probable and more fully justified.

But these various influences—various in themselves, but alike hostile to naturalism—will be far surpassed in their efforts when, by slow degrees, the fundamental truths of philosophy—alike the

---

<sup>1</sup> See "A Limit to Evolution," *Nineteenth Century* for 1894. Reprinted in our "Essays and Criticisms." Osgood, McIlvaine & Co.

prolegomena of all science and of all religion—have forced their way into the active, enterprising minds of a younger generation. Then the non-theistic theory of “evolution” (absurdly named evolution) will, by degrees, give place to a true, logical system of evolution which will justify the name it bears.

According to that system, the whole universe was created by a Being the prototype of all wisdom, all virtue and all beauty, who bestowed on it the power to evolve, by His ever-present sustentation and concurrence, whatever He had involved within it at the first moment of its creation, and had thus truly Himself created *in potentia*. Thus all is order and harmony in the organic as well as in the inorganic world—life, feeling, thought, society, ethics, politics, art and science successively appearing with no less spontaneity than the various senses, instincts and habits of living but non-rational nature. To the knowledge which is merely direct and immediate succeeds knowledge which is more and more reflective, self-conscious and deliberate, till, under and through Divine interposition—no less omnipotent because imperceptible—the highest activities of which human nature is capable are attained. Since the universe, as being essentially one, could never have been submitted to the action of any sort of natural selection, its power and properties must have been due to the creative will of God, and the results of their action (the perverse results of man’s free-will excepted) must have been likewise preordained. Our knowledge is his gift, and our most important knowledge is that of our true relationship to Him, and thus what is at once the most important agent, as well as the highest end, of evolution, as rationally understood, is and must be, that which reveals to us our duties and our privileges—namely, religion.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.





## ROME AND ITS RECENT RUINS.

THE eternal city, long famous for its classical ruins, now runs the risk of finding a place in a less noble category of famous names. If it does not actually become a ruined city—and who would expect Rome in its eternal splendor ever to be ruined?—still it is threatened with the vulgar fate of presenting a partial spectacle of modern ruins. Within the last twenty-five years there has been scattered over it a pretty conspicuous layer of this latest article of manufacture, the wreck and ruin of modern enterprise. The syndicate of speculators who took the fortunes of the city in hand a while ago, first calling themselves “United Italy,” then knocking down a part of the walls with a few shells, and finally riding in on a kind of wooden horse called a “plebiscite,” have accomplished so much in their peculiar line that they are just going to celebrate the jubilee of their twenty-fifth year at a thriving trade; and the exhibition of ruins already prepared will throw the celebration into quite a becoming relief. It is not the first time a power of this kind, of money and speculation, has lorded it through the streets of Rome. It was said of the vile Didius Julianus, who once bought the empire at auction:

Didius, vile usurer, through the crowd he mounts,  
Beneath his feet the Roman eagle cowers,  
And the red arrows fill his grasp uncouth.

But then the Roman empire was pagan; and Didius was not a Jew. Now he is.

Some of the ruins we speak of are such in the ordinary sense of the word. They are ghastly broken-down piles of houses, which fell down while the speculators were raising them. They are the unsightly masses of tenement houses, which were intended to look like modern palaces, but which incontinently found their proper place as tenements, more or less occupied. Fortunately, both of these classes of typical modern adornment settled in quarters of their own, either amid the unoccupied portions of the ancient hills, or in the Vatican meadows, where their foundations went down with the Pope's excommunication upon them—and the buildings followed their foundations. They too went down. In fact, morally speaking, they never went up. They are an economical and social waste.

Another kind of modern ruin is less distinguishable in its outlines. One is just on the point of collapsing—this government, which

no speculators, however wild, would invest their capital in for a day, which foreign creditors are suing for the interest on their loans, and which the nation seems to be eluding by emigrating to America. It has committed many errors, poor thing! and the deputies and senators and ministers, and particularly the ex-ministers, are all saying so. Still, we must admit, little as we love it, that no one ever charges it with a single error committed from that point of view, whence "United Italy" commanded the situation. United Italy had in view just what we see in process of execution; and part of that is an accomplished fact. It meant to fill its pockets, transact business, and make hay while the spring sun shone. The patriots came, of course, to make Rome the centre and home of a redeemed nation. But they have taken care not to make it their own home. The Piedmontese comes to Parliament, and is off again; and the Sicilian comes and is off; and the Neapolitan comes and goes again. His love for United Italy is not of a kind to invite his staying in the new centre of Italy; it rather invites him to stay at home, till the crash comes. And then he will be found to be the identical Italian who, in the Middle Ages, fought at Sienna with Florence, and at Genoa with Venice, and at Naples with Sicily or the world generally. He will be able to do so again: and do it better than govern Italy from Rome.

There is another order of ruins, much more serious in their kind. It is the steady undermining of social and religious life, of all the laws of propriety and morality, through the usual machinery and propagandism of education, the press, the theatre. The profession of these speculators was to build up, to adorn, to embank, to purify and to drain. They have embanked the Tiber with marble, and they have engineered the drainage out of the city limits. And probably both were profitable transactions. But these feats were nothing compared with the embankment they have raised and the moat they have dug round the new kingdom of Italy, under the form of a military system, which, we make bold to say, cannot compare in cleanliness with the mud walls of old Britain, or the refuse heaps of prehistoric Denmark. The military system includes the barrack life of all the youth of Italy, the enforced absence of religious influences, the contagion of the worst morals, and the absolute waste of the best years in men's lives, for all purposes of serious study, of art and agriculture. If, as some one has recently said of France, one man in every ten has a vocation to the ecclesiastical or religious life, it is a miracle if one vocation out of ten comes safe through such an ordeal of corruption. And it is a further marvel then, if one in every ten of the small residue will be blessed with the means and facilities after-

wards for developing and bearing fruit, and yielding one priest or religious out of a hundred vocations.

### I.

This is what we mean by recent ruins. A more distinct view may be taken of them if we look at them *in situ*, as the archæologists say ; that is to say, in their own place. This does not mean, it is their natural place ; but only that we find them here. It is thus that broken pottery or crunched bones are said to be found *in situ* ; though the place where they are found may be very respectable indeed. And so recent ruins are found in Rome. They lie too amid other ruins of a very different stamp :

The tomb of empire ! ruins that efface  
Whate'er of finish'd, modern pomp can boast.

Those are the ancient ruins, dating from an aurora of civilization which ushered in the Christian day ; ruins left by a power which fought all the battles till the Prince of Peace should come ; ruins of a structure which, when completed, was then slowly dismantled that the Vicar of Christ might mount into the place prepared for him. The place so prepared was Rome, the eternal city, Christian and Papal. It stands upon the tomb of an empire ; nor does the sprinkling of modern ashes on it at present shake its patience or impair its peace.

There is an inside view that can be taken of Rome, and an outside one also. We look at it inside when we take our stand in the sanctuary ; or in the school and library, which first found their place, so to speak, in the sacristy ; or in the asylum and hospital which rested against the walls of the sanctuary.

The outside view comes before the interior, and we will take that first. Nowhere is this more singular than in Rome. Nowhere does the external grandeur seem to be less in proportion to the interior than in the outer covering of the concentrated splendor and riches which eighteen centuries of Christian devotion and enlightenment have accumulated here. And the inside too has an exterior to it, which is different from the soul and the life, from the spirituality and the divine conception, that have overflowed into the marble and the mosaic, that have swelled into the outline and glowed into color ; and which palpitates to the Christian sense, itself throbbing with the thoughts and feelings expressed in these monuments, ten, twelve, fifteen centuries ago.

Now the eye of a child or of a savage may look long and intently, and yet see no more than colors, nor deeper than shapes. The conceptions it fails to see. Perspective is not discerned ; the parts are not correlated ; the whole is but a surface of many

things, bright, colored, varied, big. And the eye wearied wanders away to something else. This is one manner, quite external, of viewing even the interior of Rome. It is the view most commonly taken. The way of doing it is reduced to a system; so that such as follow the *régime* of the system cannot well do anything else.

You may see on any day, and almost at any hour, tourists and streams of them, running hither and thither with their guide-books in hand, adjusting the sight of what is before them to the paragraph and line of their manual; and then off to another spot and another page. We do not speak of pilgrims but of tourists. Soon they will have done it all; they will be off from Rome; and they will have seen nothing or less. And, actually, among the things they will have been directed to admire, are the post-office and the treasury, for which in all honesty they need not have left Washington or London, or Paris or Berlin. Of that kind of thing there are better sights elsewhere; and better too, for not having been convents profaned, which were turned into bureaus and barracks and stables.

The guide-book of this class of admiring humanity, who are made thus to see so little after they have come so far, is generally the product of a German artist, who, an adept in his legitimate profession, furnishes the clue to every particular through the labyrinth of antiquity and religion and Papal power and Italian unity. But his profession does not include the qualification of being a Christian. And it is not singular that all the true life and personality of Rome should be a dead blank to his eye and intelligence, when Christianity did nothing more in Rome than form "an interesting community," as he calls it; and when the Christian history with which it teems is nothing but "legends," and "only traditions," and miracles more or less "preposterous." And so he betrays as much satisfaction in conducting the traveller blindfolded through the life of the sanctuaries, as in opening his eyes wide to Methodist, Baptist and Episcopalian Churches, and to a system of so-called asylums, hospitals and monuments, which have the merit of overflowing, almost like works of art, with the vitality of their inside meaning. Everything that redeeming Italy has done in Rome has the merit of expressing this meaning; it reeks with the vice of its origin and purpose. Infidel Germany catches the refrain promptly, responsive to liberal Italy—two members of a triple alliance, worthy of one another. The third member, the hapless tourist, might have lighted on better company.

It is not so that the Christian eye is couched to behold even what is merely external in the city of Rome. To it there is appa-

rent that tranquil character of exalted religion, of a repose which is worthy of thoughts that are eternal. The most recent monuments, only three or four centuries old, awaken thoughts in his mind worthy of the massive grandeur which the religious sentiment has thus assumed; while the more ancient shrines and churches open a vista of retrospective history, bewildering in its depth of nearly two thousand years. And these two thousand years are set in a background of seven hundred farther on, where the broken outlines of old pagan Rome are distinctly seen, as those of a powerful genius hired to prepare the ground for eternal Rome to begin.

All down this lapse of time, while powerful nations have been flitting into existence and out again, what a history is read—a single one; and, we might say, the history of only one! It is that of the Vicar of Christ, amid the perishable elements of matter and men. The names that are inscribed in his scroll are many. They are written on façades and on fountains, on obelisks and bridges. Many are the names among those of two hundred and fifty Popes, which appear all over the seven hills, the site of imperial Rome, or off the hills, the site of Papal Rome. They are over the gates which admit the pilgrims; they are on altars, before which he prays; they are on sepulchres where popes were laid, or in catacombs, which witnessed the shedding of their blood. Everywhere the life of the Papacy is written in the stones of Rome, telling of thirteen nations that have been represented in the Chair of Peter, of thirty-five martyrdoms, of forty expulsions from the city of the Holy See, and of more than two hundred and fifty vacancies, which called for a new successor to the throne of Christendom. Rome glories in all these names, except in one place. That is upon the throne itself. There is only one name there—Peter's. The names of all the rest have been in benediction, only because they continued his office, and kept for a while in his place the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

## II.

Under the feet of Papal Rome lies its predecessor. In its most characteristic portions, imperial Rome is buried twelve feet below the level of busy thoroughfares; in some places it was buried twenty and even forty feet deep. In parts it has been unearthed by the enterprise of recent Sovereign Pontiffs; in other parts it has yet to be uncovered. The presence of what remained of it was a large factor in shaping the location of the Papal city. Such a mass of ruins on the seven hills drove mediæval Rome down to the old Campus Martius. The stones, as if they were those of quarries, went into the walls of palaces and churches. The mar-

bles formed the stairways of houses and the washing-tables of laundries. The sarcophagi of senators served excellently as vats and troughs; and we need not think they were degraded by doing so. The remains which cover the Campagna, like a vast circumference of broken rocks, "rent palaces, crushed columns, rifled moles," have received an honor they never deserved, and one denied to the ruins of any other city in the world; they are there, and history is read in them; they are gloated on by the generations which come and go; and all this, because Papal Rome is here, and has enshrined them, and has made them a part of her associations and of her life.

And, there is no doubt of it, but the first Rome and the second, the Rome of the ancient republic and empire and the Rome of the Papacy and Christendom, formed in many respects but one current of history. One dominant character of both has been that of dominion over all, permeating all. The one gathered the scattered elements of the peninsula, and then a large portion of the world, into a political unit. The other has gathered the nations into one Christendom and united them in the Kingdom of God. The former shot out its aggressive forces, pushed, swayed, thrust itself onwards; and, when it had made this country its own, it still pushed and drove outwards over the surface of the globe; and, after arriving at a stage of open decay, it still pushed and drove; and it stopped driving its trade only when it died. The other has been very much like the former. It has shed its light and sent abroad its couriers of peace; it has spent its blood and life, never exhausted, however expensive might be the conquest of the world to Christ; and, still aggressive in its teaching of the nations, it looks forward self-possessed to the consummation of the world as the termination of its own career.

Again they agree. The former Rome bound down without destroying local or national life; its force lay in respecting the organism of nature, while imposing the bonds of an artificial empire. The latter Rome has done more, without any artificial element in her empire, except the culture and civilization which she freely donated. She has simply entered into the life of peoples and leavened them. She has formed them as nations. And, if there came from them those who would live with her at home, she has been so facile and reverential towards them, that nowhere under the sun has such a union of customs, habits, languages, rites, ever been seen, as at all times in this city. Under the shadow of the Vatican are the *borghi* or *scholæ* of the Saxons (the English), of the Frisians, the Longobards and the Franks. Under the Capitol is the *schola* of the Greeks. In the Trastevere, on the other side of the Tiber from the Capitol, is the quarter of the Jews, where

St. Peter began his ministry; and later on a quarter was assigned them, the Ghetto on the opposite bank, even till our own time. Besides all this, there is the extensive Strangers' Quarter, which still belongs to them, especially to English people and Americans, under the Pincian Hill and around the Piazza di Spagna.

But, in another respect, the two Romes do not agree. Like a thing of earth the former went to earth; and for the class of beings to which it belonged there is never a resurrection. The other of a diviner mould, though in earthly form, living a life from above, though cast in the conditions of time, requires only the freedom and independence of action, guaranteed by nature to all children of men; and for the rest it proceeds on principles which are not of this world. The independence and freedom of the Papacy means liberty to move among the freely flowing elements of political existence all round about; it means temporal independence, which for a ruler, for a supreme authority in the world, means territorial independence, otherwise called temporal sovereignty. This is a privilege which, in our days of liberty and equality as much as at any time before, the commonest herd of freebooters think they have a right to claim for themselves—be it in the Sandwich Islands or in Cuba. Exacting only this condition for dealing with Christendom and the world, the Papacy at Rome puts forth its powers, as ever before, evangelizing and civilizing the world.

Now let us take an inside view of Rome.

### III.

Why so many Churches here? One hears the question asked. And one may also hear the wise counsel added: schools or hospitals would do better, in place of such a superfluity. Here a double judgment is conveyed; one, that is there no sufficient reason for such an exhibition of Catholic faith and devotion, as Rome exhibits to the Christian world; another, that there is sufficient reason for attending more to education and charity.

Both of these judgments deserve to be credited to that ready wisdom conspicuous in some travellers, who seem to read the whole life of a city or nation from the window of a railway carriage, who deliver themselves promptly of their sentiment lest it should spoil if they kept it for second thoughts, and who pass on quickly to Egypt, Berlin, Paris, home, for fear if they stayed longer, they might possibly learn more. It is thus that the action of Catholics in not taking part in political life, and of the Holy Father in forbidding them to do so, is all taken in at a glance, sometimes from a distance of many thousand miles; and is promptly retailed in the journals, or in more respectable places. In fact, it is on this kind of political observation that most politi-

cal liberalism is based, at least on the continent of Europe. It is easiest to pick up, and cheapest to rehearse.

With respect to charity and beneficence in Papal Rome, there are so many currents, circulating in so many institutions, that the ordinary Commercial Directory, which does not profess to treat of this department in Roman life, makes the following general observation :

"Conservatories, institutes, hospices and refuges. The *opere pie* or institutions of beneficence, amount in number to 341 in Rome with an annual revenue of about 5,000,000 lire, without taking account of the Confraternities (which aim chiefly at a religious object and are for purposes of mutual benefit). These Confraternities by themselves amount to over a hundred, with a revenue of over a million lire a year. The principal hospices, conservatories and refuges (the list of which we subjoin) have in general the following purposes in view: Help for the poor classes and those which are less well provided for, as well in sickness as in health; assistance, education and reform, both moral and religious; literary instruction, and training for any profession, art or trade. These institutions are run on the revenues coming from the capital of their own foundations; a small portion on private charity. They are directed and administered partly by municipal commissions, and partly by ecclesiastics or private persons."

After this general summary, the directory gives a list of fifty-eight principal institutes of beneficence. Among these, only four betray themselves by their names as belonging to the present *régime*, since redeemed Italy came to redeem Rome. We may presume that no more than four of this class are to be found in Rome, or they would certainly be here, among the "principal" charities. One of the four is the "Gould Memorial Home; which has for its object the religious education (?) and instruction of boys in typesetting, etc., and of girls in sewing, etc. Mrs. E. Edwards, directress and administrator."

As so many of the Roman charities are for the young of all conditions, they must also be considered as educational institutions. Of schools properly so called, it would be a rash attempt on the part of a stranger to attempt to classify them, though they are but the relics of numberless houses, which have been duly emptied of their religious communities by these foreigners who walked into Rome, twenty-five years ago. Still more hopeless would it be to summarize, over and above all that we have mentioned, the hospitals, properly so called, the infant asylums, the dormitories, the vast system of eleemosynary institutions called in general the *Monte di Pietà* of Rome, the orphan asylums, the departments of the Congregation of Charity, and so forth—all coming from the funds



of Papal Rome, with its capital of Christian charity amassing itself in the course of ages.

The judgments of men have been quite characteristic of our times, with regard to all this vast organization of the Christian Church. Men are hard to please ; and sometimes Christian men. Under Pius IX. it was said that there was a superfluity of schools in Rome and in his States ; and we know how, at the same time, this is precisely the part of the world which is a specimen of " illiteracy and ignorance," according to the statistics of many people. It has always been a commonplace, in apparently respectable history, that monasteries make the people poor, by feeding on them ; and at the same time the same kind of history puts it down that monasteries make the people idle by feeding them. The fact is, that the primal instinct of all this liberalism looks upon all this money and land as locked up too exclusively in charity, religion and Christian enlightenment ; and it would like to get at some of it. Its common sense dictates that to get salaries out of it would suit itself better. And, when the common brutality is then brought to its door, of leaving the poor and the sick and the orphan destitute of their patrimony, liberalism idolizes the paternalism of the State, to be exercised by means of taxation. Now it requires not much, even of a fund of common sense, to know that the whole policy of modern taxation means getting others to pay, and escaping one's self. And the louder one talks of such " even-handed " taxation, the more humanitarian and patriotic he is. Such is the humanitarianism and charitable patriotism which has supplanted the civilization of Christendom. We have a signal instance of it here in Rome.

When these foreigners broke down the wall at the Porta Pia they knew they were walking into a harvest. Their experience in every part of Italy previously had made them quite expert in the art of reaping it. And, if the extraordinary wealth of administration which lay before them at all embarrassed their consciousness for a moment, the parallel experience of governments like unto themselves, in France, Spain, Portugal since the latter part of the eighteenth century, must have served to reassure their shrinking modesty.

Two great strokes of statesmanship demonstrated at once the extent of their native ability and the high degree of liberal education which they carried with them on the backs of their horses on riding into Rome. They declared all religious orders and congregations to be non-existent before the law, and to the goods of these non-entities they, " the nation," succeeded, *ab intestato*. For the goods were without an owner. Here was a splendid fund of revenues clamoring for their patronage. They could not decline

the appeal. And such a wealth of real estate in the shape of convents, from which helpless religious women were driven out; of monasteries, where the poor need apply no more; of colleges, which foreign governments were not in a position to protect, devolved upon the new paternal government, that there is not a mule in the government employ to-day which does not seem to have the choice of a dozen monasteries for its lodging, and, perhaps, a dozen or two of convent-chapels. And, even so, there is embarrassment. Hence these foreigners have thought of converting this real estate into a more useful kind of wealth. They have offered to *sell* it back to its owners.

The other stroke of statesmanship was called "conversion." The religious being non-existent and their goods quite safe, there remained, inconveniently enough, all the funds of ecclesiastical and charitable property, with the owners, or, at least, the administrators, still in existence. Hence these goods were not yet safe. The new statesmen were promptly equal to the emergency. They "converted" the goods—that is to say, they turned everything into a common heap for their bureaus to administer, with a high right of dominion over all, if not with the immediate handling and *improving* of the funds. In this manner all the incomes of churches, all the resources for the support of canons, ecclesiastics, dignitaries, cardinals, and even the Pope, all the property on which the physical conditions of existence depended, both for the maintenance of ecclesiastical life in Rome and for the government of the Church universal, went to constitute a fund very sacred, for which these foreigners hold themselves strictly responsible, and responsible to themselves alone. When the government becomes bankrupt, then, of course, they will be discharged from their sacred trust; they will not be responsible even to themselves; and the stage of "conversion" will have passed on duly and sweetly into the finality of non-existence or annihilation.

#### IV.

From the account we have given of the resources provided for charity and beneficence in Rome it is clear that, if there are many churches, it is not because there are few hospitals or schools. Hence the question remains just as it presented itself at first—why are there so many churches?

We imagine that the correct answer is: So far are they from being too many that there might be more. The same conditions which brought these into existence might add to them; and new conditions are actually doing so.

We may count over 310 public churches here. Yet, when the new quarters were added recently, occupied chiefly by govern-

ment employees, Piedmontese, Sicilians, etc., parish churches had to be provided in their midst. And, if the monumental Church of St. Joachim had not been commenced promptly in the quarter of the Vatican meadows, it is said that the capital of Catholicity would have seen a Protestant—a Baptist—meeting-house taking precedence of the Pope under his own windows.

But, apart from such new circumstances, the same conditions which gave rise to so many, in times gone by, might add more at any time. Thus it is generally well known that a new monumental church to St. Patrick is being presented as a worthy object of zeal and national devotion to the liberality of the children of St. Patrick, who are scattered all over the world. And why should not any new Religious Order or Congregation provide itself with a sanctuary of its own there, where its central government, its principal monastery or college, is situated under the eyes of the Holy Father? And, besides all this, we may take note of the important fact that churches in Rome are very much what your statues are in Paris or Washington, in London or New York. There you may see men on horseback and men on foot. In two parks of New York there are statues of Mazzini and Garibaldi; in London a monument was erected to perpetuate in stone a lie against the reputation of Catholics; Paris bristles with marble memorials of its men of blood; it will not take long for Germany to be covered all over with similar eruptions in honor of a man of iron, who is still living. Why should not Rome, in the course of those sixteen centuries during which it has been the capital of a Christian world, have swelled forth into a great classic monument, all of it, indeed, to the glory of Him who gave His heroes and heroines to illuminate the Church of God, but at the same time, piece by piece, to the honor of each of those saints who are the sole glory and delight of humanity upon earth? These excite no unsavory recollections, nor those associations of every kind of moral foulness, with which the brief lives of so many mundane worthies have gone down reeking into the bowels of the earth. These are the lilies and the flowers and the fruits of God's grace and wisdom among the children of men; and, since their lives were too short, though their work was eternal, Rome may well immortalize them with an expression of human art, as like to themselves as possible—sanctuaries to the living God, beautiful and imperishable. Here it is that those lamps of architecture, which Ruskin so well describes, may be seen in all their brightness—the spirit of religion, of sacrifice, of faith, and of truth, of beauty and of strength.

Unable to trace in a paragraph the world of meaning which it takes years to read in the monuments themselves, we may content

ourselves with looking at them from on'y one point of view. We may look at them under this precise aspect, that they make of the eternal city a kind of gallery of monumental glory to the great ones of earth and heaven; and that they do so precisely on the ground, on these hills, in those hollows, around and in each forum, and by the side of every classic way, where earth had raised the most stupendous worship ever paid to the spirits of evil—in that “habitation of devils,” as St. John described the great Babylon, in that “guard-house of every unclean spirit,” in that pagan Rome, which, as it was the mistress and centre of a fallen world, so was likewise the organization and deification of every kind of sin that the world could think of and try to enjoy. “The great Babylon is fallen, is fallen!” And precisely there, where it fell, Christian Rome was found standing, to point the moral of the past, while it transformed the nation into the glories of the future.

But, not to miss any part of the lesson taken in even by so rapid a glance, we should have our eyes open to a phenomenon of the present, and notice the reflection of old heathen Rome, then happily buried, on the face of the spirit of evil still unhappily alive here in our days. In a certain kind of history, it is old Rome that presents the ideal of civilization, while the papacy and Christianity were a misfortune, a disaster. All that Christianity did was to aggrandize the Popes and bring misery and degradation upon the world. If art survived at all, it was by an accident of some kind; and what did survive, alas! went into churches! Let us quote a passage, a popular presentation of the German historical wisdom of our day. It is printed for the special benefit of travellers who visit the Eternal City:

“The transformation of heathen into Christian Rome was accompanied by the gradual development of the papacy as the supreme ecclesiastical power in the west. Leo the Great (A.D. 440–461), and Gregory the Great (590–604), may be regarded as the chief originators of this scheme of aggrandizement. These prelates and their successors were indefatigable in their efforts to realize their project, and under their auspices, notwithstanding the poverty and misery into which Rome had sunk, new churches and monasteries were constantly springing up among the ruins of antiquity; and the last feeble spark of artistic taste which still survived was devoted to the decoration of these buildings,” etc.<sup>1</sup>

This sounds like a genuine passage from the most approved historical wisdom of infidel Germany. It deserves an offset; and suggests its form. We might give it thus:

The transformation, back again, of Christian into heathen society,

---

<sup>1</sup> Baedeker's *Central Italy; History of the City of Rome*, p. 33.

at the close of the nineteenth century, is accompanied by the development of dogmatic ignorance as the supreme intellectual power in various parts of Europe. The centuriators of Magdeburg, who carried on the work of the Reformation into the realm of history, may be regarded as the chief originators of this scheme of intellectual darkness. These reformed historians and their descendants are indefatigable in their efforts to realize their project, and bring darkness out of light. Under their auspices, notwithstanding the wealth of historical lore and archives open to their inspection, new theories of dogmatism and darkness are constantly springing up to spread over the history of the past. And the last feeble spark of classic literature or taste which still survives is devoted to the ornamentation of these lucubrations, etc.

So, turning our backs on this cloud of ignorance, we may enjoy a more unobstructed view of the lights and glories of papal Rome. We shall address ourselves to only a few of them.

## V.

The history of Christian Rome in its monuments, from the beginning of our era up to the end of the third century, is sufficiently described in one word, which we take from the *Fasti* or Records of the sacred city: "A.D. 302, the Christians for the tenth time put to torture and to death by order of Diocletian Augustus. The temples of the Immortal God levelled to the ground. The volumes of sacred letters consigned to the flames." It was just four years after this, when fire and sword had already visited whatever was to be found above ground or under ground, that the first charter of citizenship in the Roman world was given by Constantine to the God of the world.

Up to that time the history of religion and charity, of instruction and purity, has to be gathered chiefly from sand-pits five stories deep. Here the innocent and the holy ones of earth slipped in for their devotions and their burials, to be fed with the Divine Word, and to live on the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar. And so the victims were ever kept dressed and fillet-crowned for the day of their sacrifice. And, when that moment came, God, who never leaves Himself without a testimony to His existence, honored Himself with the most signal testimony to His mercy. He flashed on the eyes of a brutal and vicious population the light of such a divine presence in the innocence, purity and grace of His martyrs, that the response of a hardened conscience was slowly elicited in their butchers, and the admiration of the natural human soul, however reluctantly, was gradually won. Indeed, if in our own times of moral and religious disaster, any one is led to inquire how it comes that the first to suffer in the goods of hearth

and home, and in the greater goods of reputation and the means to exercise their charity and mercy among men, are precisely the pure and the holy ones, souls consecrated to God, or souls out in the world most faithful to their Christian profession, he may observe that the same law is being exactly applied. The one means which was adequate for establishing the Church in the world is being employed for restoring her. That is to say, sacrifice—not of the vile, the corrupt, whose savor is not sweet, but of the choicest souls, the beautiful ones, whose company the angels court. And thus, when these Jews and Freemasons turn out of house and home hundreds and hundreds of holy communities, and treat cloistered virgins as outlaws in the name of modern enlightenment, God is defeating His enemies by their own blows; He is accepting of personal sacrifice from the children of His love, and, when His own good time comes, He will give what has been so faithfully paid for.

The parish church of the parish priest and bishop of Rome stands on the Cœlian Hill as the first great monument of papal Rome. The Lateran Palace, which belonged to the Emperor, was formed into the residence of the head of a new empire, with his Church beside it. To the right and left, on the central columns of the portico, the basilica has this magnificent inscription, teeming with meaning and with a mystery of Divine Providence in each of its four words: *Omnium Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput*, “Mother and head of all the Churches.” The baptistery of St. John was raised in imperial splendor aside of it. And now a new art commenced in the world.

Where the sacred remains of apostles and of martyrs lay, where their blood had been shed, where their power was felt, and the devotion of a reviving world poured itself forth as the human heart will always give utterance to its admiration and worship, there the glory of the friends of God was celebrated in stones and in shrines, in painting and mosaics, in gifts countless and inestimable. There rose St. Peter's on the Vatican hill, St. Paul's outside the walls, the churches of St. Laurence and St. Agnes outside of the Esquiline and Viminal gates. Those of St. Valentine and St. Callistus were also placed outside, while Liberius erected on the Esquiline hill the magnificent basilica of St. Mary Major, the largest of the eighty churches dedicated in Rome to the honor of the Blessed Virgin. St. Laurence was honored by St. Damasus at the theatre of Pompey, and also on the Ardeatine way. The former church was thenceforth called St. Laurence in Damaso. Similar monuments were erected to Sts. Gervase and Protase in the Vallis Quirini; to St. Sabina on the Aventine; Sts. Laurence and Lucina by the Via Lata, now the Corso; St. Stephen on the

Latin way; St. Cornelius on the Appian way; St. Stephen on the Cœlian hill; St. Bibiana and St. Andrew on the Esquiline; St. Peter's on the Tiburtine way; Sts. Silvester and Martin on the Esquiline; St. Agatha and also St. Pancratius on the Aurelian way; Sts. Cosmas and Damian in the forum; Sts. Philip and James. The Pope, St. Gregory the Great, began a career worthy of his future pontificate by abdicating the prefecture of the city, and establishing a monastery in his own house, where he himself professed the monastic life. Then, as Pope, he dedicated St. Agatha's in Suburra, and restored and adorned the temples in all directions. Under Honorius we have St. Apollinaris on the Vatican; the Four Crowned on the Cœlian; Lucy at the Suburra; Hadrian, where the forum Romanum connects with the forum of Cæsar and that of Nerva; Anastasius *ad aquas Salvias*; Cyriacus on the Ostian way. So, running on towards the eighth century, we need only mention, further, St. Paul's and St. Bibiana's; St. Sebastian's; St. George's, in the *forum boarium*; St. Petronilla on the Vatican; St. Stephen's and St. Silvester's; St. Peter's and St. Paul's, on the Sacra Via.

These are only some of the landmarks placed between the beginning of the fourth and the commencement of the ninth century—a length of time greater than the entire duration of modern nations like Russia and Prussia, and about twice as long as that of civilized history on the continent of North America. Yet it was but the introduction to papal history in the world. It may be observed that, as the Romans of old erected sacred stones to mark off boundaries and to consecrate territories to their own holy genius of proprietorship, so had the spirit of Christianity marked off every one of the seven hills, with the Vatican and Janiculum besides. It had consecrated the fora of the Emperors, the Sacred Way, and every one of the other ways—the Lavican, Ostian, Appian, Nomentan, Aurelian, Latin, which had trembled under the tread of the Roman legions, had vibrated to the rattle of the carriages of the great, and which still stood lined with the ostentatious tombs of pagan mourning and glory decayed.

Later on, when the barbarians had exhausted all their fury on the Rome of the seven hills, and mediæval nobles were carrying on the work of destruction in new forms, those seven hills, where palaces, thermæ, and theatres had gloried in all the splendors described by St. John in the Apocalypse, came to be covered with vineyards and gardens even till our own time, and nought but those monuments of Christian devotion stood erect in the civic waste. Papal Rome had extended down into the old Campus Martius, and over to the Vatican across the Tiber.

The dreary period of mediæval history did not pass without new

embellishments and new monuments for the gallery of Christian heroism and sanctity. However, it is a uniform experience that, when religion and piety fall to a lower level, the burning lamps of sacrifice and beauty and truth, which are fed by the unction of the spirit within, decline and fade proportionately. In every line of achievement, monuments become scarce—in stone, in religious genius, in life and the pouring forth of blood for the service of God in religious institutes of self-consecration. On the other hand, given an access of the vital spirit, we witness a spectacle like that which animated all Europe in the later Middle Ages. Gothic cathedrals of inimitable structure covered the soil, foundations for every conceivable kind of charity, religious institutes for every possible form of zeal, and such an intensity of Christian piety in the general body of the faithful, that it seemed as if the whole world were running into the life of higher mysticism. What wonder that votive offerings should multiply, from the widow's mite to the prince's domain, in churches, monasteries, hospices for the traveller and hospitals for the suffering, institutions of every kind under the shadow of the Cross! And the law laid down by Urban, pope and martyr, under whom Cæcilia of blessed memory illuminated the Church with her charity and sanctity, held as a first principle, sanctioned by every natural and divine right: "The goods of the faithful, which are offered to the Lord, must not be converted to any other use than the service of the Church, or of Christian brethren, or of the poor, because they are the vows of the faithful and the redemption of sin and the patrimony of the poor."

And so in Rome, when the long absence of the popes and the great schism were followed by a revival of Catholic life, Martin V. set about the restoration of the decaying edifices; the cardinals vied with one another in renewing their titular churches; Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., and Julius II. adorned the papal city with monuments either new or restored.

Under Gregory XIII., at the close of the sixteenth century, we may notice the inauguration of the last stage of sacred architecture, with regard both to style and purpose. As to style, the Gesu furnished a type for succeeding generations. As to purpose, though the collegiate system was already old in Rome, Gregory XIII. not only founded a college for the Greeks, but added the Church of St. Athanasius, and with the English College he dedicated the Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Following in his footsteps soon afterwards, Cardinal Ludovisi laid the foundations of the vast sacred edifice for the use of the Roman College, the Church of St. Ignatius.

## VI.

We have sketched sufficiently for our purpose the interior life



of Rome, as immortalized in the sanctuary. There remain its manifestations in the way of charity and of culture; that is to say, in the asylum, hospital, or other forms of beneficence, and in the school or library.

But the summary which we gave above, from a very unprejudiced quarter, of the vast organization which the spirit of beneficence has established in Rome, must stand in place of further development. A large portion of it was due to the charity of foreign princes, nations, confraternities. For no Christians have ever considered Rome as foreign to themselves. And, if there remains at the present moment a very considerable portion of that former organization "unconverted" into the funds which the governing cabal have transferred into their coffers, it is only because other nations or governments, Catholic and non-Catholic, have interposed and bidden the speculators to keep their hands off. At all times the needs of suffering or indigent humanity have come first and last to the door of the popes, from the time of Leo I. to the time of Leo XIII. Gregory the Great, who, as a secular, founded seven monasteries, could tell the Princess Theoctista, when he was pope, how he was supporting, in time of distress, 3000 nuns, who had not wherewith to protect themselves "from the piercing cold" of the winter nights; and he told the Empress Constantina how the Church of Rome, while expending so much on clerics, monasteries, the poor, the people, and on the Lombards themselves (ferocious barbarians as they were), was moreover weighed down by the affliction of all the churches. This, of course, was in times of exceptional distress. In general, the monasteries and convents were themselves the support of the poor and needy, who have always found refreshment there, where poverty was practiced for the sake and love of Christ.

As to schools and culture generally, were it not that Rome is so much besides, it might simply be called a university city for the multitude of its collegiate institutions. Our tastes would lead us to speak of education, and trace its course under the shadow of the Mother Church of Christendom. But our circumstances invite us, rather, to say a word upon the treasured-up sources of learning, due exclusively to the sustained energy of the Popes. One part of these constitutes the library, the richest in choice manuscripts of all the libraries in the world, and worthy of its place amid the 11,000 apartments of the most imposing palace, as well as of its location under the shadow of the greatest Church in Christendom. Another part is made up of the Archives of the Holy See, the vastest source, under every aspect of historical lore, for every part of the world. Many departments of the Archives are distributed among the Sacred Congregations, which

have superintended, during three centuries, specific parts of the Church's administration. The Archives of the Vatican, specifically so called, are those which remained treasured up in a house by themselves, ensconced between the two arms that divide the Court of the Belvedere, leaning, so to speak, against the Library of manuscripts above, and communicating with the new Leonine Library of Consultation close by.

These Archives may be described briefly as the collection of Papal documents, registers of Papal acts, letters of the Popes, and correspondence in general. The following summary of the Vatican Archives will give a clearer idea of their contents. There are 6600 tomes of Registers of the Roman Pontiffs, from Innocent III., A.D. 1198, to Clement VIII., A. D. 1603. Of Registers of Supplications, etc., from Clement VI., 1342, to Gregory XVI., 1846, there are 7700 tomes. There is a series of Registers of Briefs from Martin V., 1417, to Clement X., 1676. The documents pertaining to the Council of Trent amount to 140 volumes. 172 contain the correspondence of divers statesmen; pertaining to the Secretary of State, 7000 volumes; to Nunciatures and Legations, 6000; of Letters from Cardinals, 158; from Bishops and Prelates, 231; from Princes, 210; from private individuals, 223; from soldiers, 179; and of the *miscellanea* belonging to the Secretary of State, 250 volumes. Add to these the diplomatic correspondence of the time of Clement VIII., Leo X. and Paul V., in what are called the Borghese Archives, about 2100 volumes. This mass of some 30,000 folio volumes constitutes the section of Papal Archives, which is housed in the Court of the Belvedere. It was opened by Leo. XIII. to historical research. A hall to accommodate some sixty or seventy students was fitted up just under the Library of Manuscripts, and custodians and porters are in attendance during the morning hours of consultation.

The contents of these folios are like a great sea of the currents of history; they are fixed there, congealed, for the perpetual contemplation of the centuries that come. We read, just as the writers narrated them, the changes, dangers, evils, progress of Christendom in every nation under the sun and in the voices of every class of society. The voices come from scenes of peace or centres of disturbance. Wars, negotiations, intrigues, claims, complaints, national interests, public and family and private ills, all seem to find in the Papacy a proper ear wherein to pour their confession, to claim redress, to ask for assistance. Official, unofficial, autocratic, democratic, ecclesiastical and secular, the voices, the tones, the hand are those of the great social, religious and political world, spread abroad and struggling, dashing in living confusion around the rock of Peter. Nor are the minutest interests

of Rome, or of any town in the Papal States, left unrepresented; here a bridge to be built, there a flood to be arrested, a rampart to be restored, a hospital to be erected. Communes, ancients, gonfalonieri, governors are heard conferring with the Secretary of the Holy Father. At certain epochs, when the pestilence is raging in some parts of the world, the letters are black and now crumbling to dust, from the disinfectants which seem to have been sprinkled over them. The handwriting varies from the imperfect signature of the blind old physician, who had served in the Netherlands the Nuncio now become Pope, and who congratulates him on his elevation, to the perfect engrossment of the official secretary—so perfect sometimes in its art of technicalities that the eye must first make out the kind of alphabet before it can decipher a sentence. Some classes of correspondence luxuriate in ciphers, and where the interpretation or the key is not added, the ciphers must be left to triumph in their luxuriant growth. The inexperienced hand of the contemplative nun in her cloister, the general writing on the eve of a battle or on the morrow, the scratch of distinguished and imperial personages signing their dictated missives, or, worse than that, writing the whole letter themselves; princes, beggars, scientists, poets, architects, especially the dignitaries and officials of the Church universal—it is all an ocean of human life, as irregular in its outlines as life itself is, and as multitudinous in its currents as the sea. Yet it represents the unit of human society, and with all its capricious variety, its irregularities and turbulence, it betrays everywhere a fixed boundary in form and level—like the restless waters of the ocean, which only oscillate even when they seem wildest, and when they break beyond their bounds also break their swelling waves. Thus far, and no farther!

And it might appear, that all this finds its exact counterpart in the great personality to whom the voice of this multitude is addressed. Verily, it is a personality, that of the Popes of Rome, all representing one, Peter, and Peter representing Christ. The Pope, too, is heard speaking, just as he is spoken to. The endorsement on the back of the letter, the scribbled pencil-mark, indicates the answer which the practical wisdom of the moment dictated; and the species of reply, as given, as delayed, as ordered not to be given, are as varied as keys in music. Whole collections consist of original minutes, with the changes made, the insertions, or simply with a line drawn through, erasing the whole. Others consist of the formal letters actually sent.

But what, perhaps, is most striking, is the personal identity of that See, which, receiving a new incumbent on the average every seven years, and showing forth in the long line the utmost diver-

sity of private interests, nevertheless, amid these alternations of personal dispositions in the Popes, of their antecedents and their tastes, of their family and national ties, diffuses one steady light through them all, stamps on them an identical official character, and maintains the same influence over men. It is the visible expression of one Providence applied to humanity through men ; it is the revelation of a "Spirit one and manifold," to exercise a divine ascendancy over us in a human way ; it is the exercise of a government far mightier than the greatest of these aged priests could ever have aspired to in the exercise of his merely natural intellect or resolute will, to control the treacherous issue of battles, to gather up the little, the poor and forsaken, to direct the stream of Christian enlightenment and civilization, of conversion and sanctification ; in short, to develop God's omnipotent mercies over the destinies of the human race.

## VII.

These reflections serve to fix one element in the question with which we began. Amid the recent ruins that are scattered over the Rome of the Popes, and over the Italian people also, the place, position, and power of one person who is interested, are as fixed and certain as the expression of a law—the divine law which gave him his commission. This fact is more striking than ever now, when everything else seems to be adrift. When all other institutions, from human sovereignty on its throne to the moral and natural law originally fixed in the hearts of men, seem to have lost their anchorage, this one power, at least, is found riding at its moorings. When every political ascendancy, that has ever been, has gone down in its turn, and those that are, at present, seem bent on proving that they can go down faster than any before, the one force of the Papacy is seen staying the rest and swaying them ; not pushing, like pagan Rome, by force of arms, nor laying too much stress on diplomacy, or liberality of sentiment, or humanitarian views ; nor again, upon that natural equipoising of forces, which, whenever humanity is disturbed, somehow brings it back to a state of equilibrium again. Such means may be adequate for settling merely natural problems. But, when the struggles that agitate the world contain elements that are not natural ; when the issue of the conflict between powers is one that looks to eternity ; there is the place for that force of the Papacy, which is its intrinsic charter of divine grace. In virtue of this it has, heretofore, quickened into life inert masses of tribes and nations. When they died, it has remained to shine on other masses, equally inert, sometimes more noxious. Its ascendancy is not changed to-day.

One event has occurred to disturb the Bishop of Rome in his

own city, and in the world. It has not been the exercise of any right on the part of any one. No one pretends that. It has simply been the accomplishment of a fact. His States have been taken away; his city has been occupied. This fact, which any thief or highway robber can accomplish, is the only right which the Revolution sets forth. It is the application of a principle which has been agitating Europe during more than a century. It is called the sacredness of the "accomplished fact." Beat down the walls of a city with cannon, occupy it. Thenceforth, it is "intangible," as Rome is proclaimed to be. The bandits speak as if, like bull-dogs, they would let all their quarters be hacked to pieces before they will loosen the grip of their teeth. There, precisely, lies the sacred tenacity of the "accomplished fact." Still, like true bandits, these people are not bull-dogs. They only sneak on the unprotected.

Though the fact is very simple, as much so as any burglary, several grave features give it an ominous air at present. One is, that in the entire course of Christian history, this is the first epoch in which any such fact has been held up as constituting a juridical right. And the new code of civilization to which such a portent belongs is being adopted widely. We have seen it applied, or at least urged, in countries far off from Italy, within the last few years.

Another feature is more grave. It is, that no such absurdity as public robbery constituting public right could possibly have recommended itself, nor have pretended to stand a single day, nor even have been set afloat on its way toward accomplishment, if there were not a current broad enough and deep enough to float it. This current is what is called "public opinion," issuing from the sources of false doctrines or corrupt morals, or, as was chiefly the case in Italy, from a deluded imagination, which was captivated some forty years ago by the phantom of a great, united, "redeemed" nation. The phantom was conjured up in the Masonic lodges. The only reality, which it was intended to mask, is now in the hands and pockets of the lodges.

A third feature is the most serious of all. The longer this fact remains in possession, the duller becomes the public sense to the enormities of public dishonesty. And, the slower things are in righting themselves and purifying their consequences, the wider becomes the pestilence resulting from the contagion. *Contagio uti pestilentia*, said Sallust. The sequel of consequences is unfolding a tail prodigious, not only for its venom—in *cauda venenum*—but for its amplitude, like that which St. John described: "And his tail dragged a third part of the stars of Heaven, and cast them to the earth." State education has already had time to coil itself

round more than three generations of the young. Those who have escaped this embrace have not escaped the barracks. The habits of home life, of serious studies, of useful arts, are all sapped. In the years of early manhood, all the young men of the country idle away their time, going about in prim uniforms, and learning how to drill and to shoot. As to ecclesiastical vocations, they are duly inoculated with a canker which settles them. Divers religious institutes are now reduced to a few old men, barely sufficient to maintain the service of those churches which have been in the hands of their Orders for centuries.

Only two steps have to be taken to set things to rights again—repentance and reconstruction. The first of these has already been taken, so far as repentance means unlearning past follies. An ex-Prime Minister, Di Rudini, speaking at Milan a couple of months ago, delivered it as his opinion that “wrong was done to the Church; the law, for instance, suppressing religious corporations, as it was accomplished, was perhaps (?) an error”; and he dilated on the wholesale public immorality of the day.<sup>1</sup> Another ex-minister, Colombo, speaking in the same city only the other day, treated another side of the question. He adverted to the deficit of one hundred millions, with which the public accounts of 1894–95 closed. As to the new taxes imposed between February and December of 1894, he said: “There remained not a single solid or liquid which was not already taxed; there was nothing left then but to tax gases and imponderables; and they have come to that. Who knows but they will come to tax also the air of the atmosphere, as matter of consumption!” The people who have felt all this keenly enough, without the declamation of politicians to quicken their perception, are engendering in their bosom a class who may yet be a match for the speculators. A rising tide of social anarchists, who will help themselves to spoils without legislation or discrimination, may yet swamp these financial anarchists, who have discriminated too punctiliously in their legislation.

After the repentance of unlearning past errors, there remains the more costly step of reconstruction. Here, unfortunately, unlearning wrong does not always mean learning right. When people are sorry for their last notion, they may still be fertile in other inventions, and only multiply ruin. It is not inventions that are wanted, whether constitutional or otherwise. It is simply the path of truth and justice, which is conspicuously one in the question of Rome, and is particularly obvious for a nation like this, which has not lost the faith. Very many, besides faith, have also

---

<sup>1</sup> *Civiltà Cattolica*, 16 Marzo, 1895, p. 759.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 Maggio, 1895, p. 482.

devotion, and lead pious lives. And the general composition of society exhibits so many solid qualities of a Catholic people! Were it not that the mass of journals is, as usual, in the hands of the corrupt element whose business it is to corrupt the minds of others, we might witness a perfectly just habit of mind in the people of the peninsula. As it is, one's Christian heart is moved to see so much charity and sociability, so much contentment with very little of the goods of this world, such resignation when persons are trying to find a bit of daily bread; and, all the while, other families are not seen, which after being in affluence, and still remaining noble, hide under the strictest privacy the direst destitution. This is part of the national chastisement for a national sin.

After all has been said, it would appear that the most grievous circumstance is the prolongation of a state of things which, the longer it lasts, shuts out more and more the possibility of things ever being seen again in their true light. The long interruption of traditions among a young generation, who are now the men of the day, prevents them from ever having had experience of a better state of things, and therefore of knowing how to mend their condition aright.

It was just in this sense that Tacitus, speaking of this same city of Rome at a former transformation, discerned the impossibility of any other result than that which was already an actual fact—a crushing despotism substituted for the freedom of the ancient republic. When Tiberius came into power, the historian remarks that the young generation of the day had all been born after the battle of Actium, after the assumption of power by Augustus Cæsar; most of the old men had been born during the civil wars, when the ancient order of things had received its death blow; who then was left that had seen and known the Republic? The names of magistrates might remain the same; peace might reign; but the past was irretrievably lost. *Domi res tranquillæ; eadem magistratum vocabula; juniores post Actiacam victoriam, etiam scenes plerique inter bella civium nati: quotusquisque reliquus qui rempublicam vidisset?*<sup>1</sup>

THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Annal.*, i., 3.

## INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

"SIC VOS NON VOBIS."

(Concluding Article.<sup>1</sup>)

WE write these lines during Whitsuntide, a period in the ecclesiastical year of the Roman Catholic Church peculiarly suggestive in connection with much that is to be written of the story of the dissemination of the truths of Christianity in the "strange tongues" of and among the Indian nations of North America during the seventeenth, the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

In our first article on "Indian Bibliographies"<sup>2</sup> we outlined the unhappy career of Louis Macie, founder of the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, D. C.; the rise and progress of this institution during the past fifty years; with a biographical notice of James Constantine Pilling, the compiler of the eight Indian bibliographies under consideration, whose life-work in this field of American history has earned for him a high place as an historian.

This first article had reference to the Eskimo, the Iroquoian and the Siouan bibliographies, embracing most interesting periods in North American history, and particularly with reference to the Catholic missions in New York during the seventeenth century, and the printed and manuscript works relating to the seventeenth, the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, in connection with these families of the North American Indian races.

Our second article,<sup>3</sup> a notice of the Algonquian bibliography, contained the nomenclature of the hundred and more Indian nations comprising this great family and the outlines of the territory inhabited by these nations; but the vast scope of the compiler's work in the record of the printed and manuscript literature relating to these peoples, including the nations which have passed out of existence and those living at the present day, forced us to confine our attention to the consideration of the events and to the printed and manuscript works described, which relate to the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

The former works were considered in their order according to

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, by James Constantine Pilling, Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1891. Royal octavo, pp. 614.

<sup>2</sup> See the AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW, vol. xviii., No. 72, p. 698, October, 1893.

<sup>3</sup> See the AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW, vol. xix., No. 75, p. 545, July, 1894.



the nationalities under which they emanated, which principally embrace the French, the Dutch and the German.

Those printed works in the Indian languages published under English auspices were not considered in the second article, nor were any of the manuscripts in the Algonquian language and written during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries considered.

Our third article<sup>1</sup> completed the consideration of the printed works in the Indian languages which appeared under English auspices during the two previous centuries; the events coincident; an outline of the status of the New England nations before the advent of the whites; the Puritan missions under John Eliot and his disciples; the melancholy fate and the final extinguishment of the primitive owners of New England soil. We contrasted the results of the Catholic missions which were contemporary with the Puritan missions among other Algonquian nations, and we showed that the nations converted during the former, nearly three centuries ago, not only survive, but we proved by incontrovertible facts and figures that they were increasing and were leading Christian lives, happy and contented.

There remain, then, the printed works described by the compiler, which have appeared during this nineteenth century; but these works and the events to which they refer deserve a more extended study than we are prepared to give them at the present time. The consideration of the life-long labors of Bishop Baraga among the Chippewas of the Lakes and of Father de Smet among the wild Algonquian and Siouan tribes of the "Rockies" will be taken up in time. We shall, therefore, bring the present series of articles on Indian bibliographies to a conclusion by a study of the descriptions, the localities where they are kept and the text of the manuscripts in the Algonquian languages which were written during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and, as far as definitely established, we shall mention the authors of these early manuscripts.

Some of these manuscripts are preserved in the national libraries of Europe; others in the archives of colleges and in private collections abroad.

Some very valuable ones are in the archives of the archbishops of Quebec and of Montreal; many, quite yellow with age, but otherwise well preserved, are in the archives of Laval University; a few others are scattered extensively where they can neither be seen nor made available, for they are guarded as relics—heirlooms of an indefinite value, which have been handed down through generations remote, from sire to son, in many of the old French families of Canada.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. xx., No. 78, p. 238, April, 1895.

Comparatively few original manuscripts in the Algonquian text are to be found in the American libraries; but a few rare examples have been acquired by gift, mostly by American philologists.

The most authentic of these manuscripts—and authenticity is, unfortunately, the exception to the rule with most—may be seen in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal, which is a Jesuit institution; but the most numerous and valuable collections, as well as the most ancient, are still preserved in the archives of the Indian missions, where their use is constantly required.

Of the languages of the thirty-two Indian nations who originally owned the soil of the New England States, but whose people have disappeared from the face of the earth, there are but few manuscripts written by Puritan missionaries extant; and these relate to the eighteenth century. In the archives of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, is preserved a vocabulary of the Massachusetts Indian languages, written by Josiah Cotton, about 1740. It is in quarto, 123 pages. There is also in the archives of the same society a vocabulary of the Massachusetts Indians by Samuel Danforth; manuscript, 49 leaves, lacking beginning and end; written in the early part of the eighteenth century. Rev. D. W. Stevens, Vineyard Haven, Mass., writes Mr. Pilling that he has six or eight sermons of Zachariah Howwoswe written in 1763. The author was probably a half-breed preacher. He died in 1821. And Mr. Stevens states that "he was the last person that used this language publicly in the world." Besides the above-described works by New England ministers, Thomas Jefferson has left several fragmentary manuscripts relating to Indian languages, of one of which, in the Unquachog dialect, he remarks: "There remain but three persons who can speak its language; they are old women." This nation once inhabited Brookhaven, south side of Long Island.<sup>1</sup>

The Moravian Missions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were conducted with such zeal and self-denial by the respective missionaries of this organization, that it is to be regretted no greater results of their labors remain. "The importance of communicating directly with the Indians," writes Mr. J. W. Jordan, of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, to the compiler of the Algonquian Bibliography, "in order to dispense with the services of an interpreter—at all times, and especially in matters of religion, an unsatisfactory medium of communication—claimed the attention of the Moravians in America at an early date. This led them to establish schools for acquiring the prevalent languages and dia-

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Jefferson was a distinguished Indian philologist. Unfortunately, in the removal of his valuable and extensive collection of manuscripts from Washington to Monticello, the trunk containing them was pillaged and its priceless contents lost.

lects of that people." An Indian school was established at Bethlehem, Pa., soon after 1742.

From Bethlehem the Indian school was removed to Guadenhutten, where it continued until that settlement was destroyed. Zeisberger, Post, and other clergymen of this church, prominent in the missions among the Indians, received their first Indian linguistic instruction in these schools.

The range of the Moravian Missions extended from the central point at Bethlehem, through Pennsylvania, westward into Ohio, and across the Michigan frontier into western Canada.

One of the most distinguished of the Moravian missionaries was John Ettwein, who came from Würtemberg to America in 1754. After forty years of labor he was made a bishop. "He preached in eleven of the thirteen original colonies, and in what is now the State of Ohio. 'In cities,' to use his own words, 'in villages, in homesteads, from pulpits, in the open air, in court-houses and barns, to many and very different classes of men.' He labored frequently among the Indians, and in 1772 led the Christian Indians from the Susquehanna to the Tuscarawas Valley of Ohio."<sup>1</sup>

The border wars of Pennsylvania, stirred up invariably by bad white men, made, for a time, the situation of the Moravian Indian converts exceedingly wretched. The same antipathy towards the Christian red man, which had prevailed in New England during Eliot's apostolate of the seventeenth century, obtained and ruled to such an extent in Pennsylvania during the eighteenth century as to stifle all feeling of humanity, and to defy local or State authorities. The sufferings and fatalities endured by the unfortunate Christian Indians, who were taken to Philadelphia to shield them from the fury of lawless white men, when described in detail, is a melancholy story, constituting, as it does, a dark chapter in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Bishop Ettwein succeeded in founding, in 1787, The Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathens, "which still exists, has a large endowment, and contributes liberal amounts toward the support of the extensive missions of the Moravian Church."<sup>2</sup>

It was by the aid furnished by this society that the philological and devotional books composed by Grube, Heckewelder, Luckenbach, Roth, and Zeisberger, all prominent missionaries, were printed; but besides the many works published, several of their manuscripts remain, mostly in Moravian institutions, but several are to be found in the library of Harvard College.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pilling, *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Appleton's *Cyclop. of Am. Biog.*, quoted by Pilling, p. 185.

These manuscripts are principally in Delaware and German, and Lenapé and German.

The inception of the first mission undertaken by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus for the conversion of the Indian races of North America, may be credited to Henry IV. of France and Navarre, "who, when confirming a grant to the Sieur de Poutrincourt, in 1608, expressed a wish that some Jesuit fathers should be sent over to labor for the conversion of the Indians."

But it was by the charity and zeal of a wealthy French lady, Antoinette de Pons, Marquise de Guercheville, that funds were provided for the first missionary expedition,<sup>1</sup> which sailed in January, 1611.<sup>2</sup>

How that enterprise was first interfered with by adverse interests in France, and finally crushed by the English buccaneer Argall, has already been outlined. After the foundation of Quebec, Champlain obtained from France four Franciscan Fathers of the Recollect reform to minister to the French settlers and to convert the natives. With Father Denis Jamay, the commissary or superior, came Fathers John d'Olbeau and Joseph le Caron, with lay brother Pacificus du Plessis. The religious reached Tadoussac on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1615. They soon began their labors at the trading-posts established by the French, and among the Montagnais Indians on the St. Lawrence, while Father Joseph le Caron, embarking with some canoes of the Hurons, penetrated to the villages of that nation. The Recollects soon learned the two great languages of Canada, the Algonquin and Huron, and preached the Gospel far and wide; but though others of their order came to share their labors, they saw that the field was too vast for them to occupy profitably.

Thereupon they invited the Fathers of the Society of Jesus to join them, and in 1625 Fathers Charles Lalemant, Enemond Masse, and John de Brébeuf arrived, to be welcomed by the Recollects, but to be eyed with distrust by many of the French, who were full of the prejudices inspired by the Huguenots.

The missions were then more zealously extended, and in the autumn of 1626 Father Joseph de la Roche Daillon, a Recollect of noble family, set out from the Huron country for the Neuter nation, who occupied both banks of the Niagara, and reached their frontier nearest to the Senecas, but barely escaped with his life. This zealous religious was, so far as can now be ascertained, the first Catholic priest from Canada who penetrated into the present

---

<sup>1</sup> See AM. CATH. QUAR. REV., vol. xix., No. 75, p. 550.

<sup>2</sup> Madam de Guercheville obtained from Louis XIII. a grant of all the territory lying between the St. Lawrence and Florida, which grant antedates the New England grant.

territory of the United States. He carried back a knowledge of the people and of the country, noting among the products the mineral oil.

The new colony of Canada had, however, but a feeble life. Neglected by the government at home, it was soon at the lowest extremity, and in July, 1629, Champlain surrendered to Captain David Kirk, an English commander, who appeared with a fleet before the starving post of Quebec.

The Recollects and Jesuits were all carried off by the English, and Catholicity had no altar or worship till the restoration of the country.

When England, by the treaty of Saint Germain des Près, in 1632, finally restored Canada to France, after dishonorably retaining a province, captured when peace had been declared between the two powers, Cardinal Richelieu offered the Canadian mission to the Capuchins; but the religious of that reform, seeing by the voyages of Champlain, and the works of the Recollect Brother Sagard, how vast a field awaited evangelical laborers, even in the territory that French energy had laid open in twenty years, in itself a mere portal to immense unexplored regions, declined to undertake the task. The great cardinal then summoned to the task the Society of Jesus, excluding the Recollects entirely.<sup>1</sup>

The passport of the first Jesuit missionaries was signed by the hand of his eminence.<sup>2</sup>

We have quoted freely from Dr. Shea, believing that it may be possible his great work on colonial church history may not have been read as extensively as the work deserves.

Besides, while writing the lines we have quoted, the personality of the doctor has been present to our mind, linked as it is with memories which captivate whenever evoked.

Here, then, commences the glorious history, with the advent of the scholarly and venerable disciples of Loyola, more than 260 years ago, of the Jesuit missions; which in time extended among the Algonquian nations, from the shores of the St. Lawrence to the head waters of Lake Superior, and from where Chicago now stands through the "Illinois country," and the prairie and mountainous regions of the great West to the Pacific Ocean. Paralyzed for a time, the first period of this history ended towards the close of the eighteenth century, and the ending of the careers of the venerable missionaries of the *old regime* of the Society of Jesus.

When the latter had disappeared from the scene of their apostolic work, their places were taken by the disciples of St. Francis

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, pp. 224, 225.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Shea writes: "I saw this passport some years ago in the Bureau des Terres, Montreal, but it has since disappeared."

and St. Sulpice, and by zealous secular and regular priests, who ministered to the Christians in the Algonquian nations, and who continue this work. But the work of danger, of self-sacrifice and of great hardship was again resumed toward the middle period of the nineteenth century by such Jesuits as de Smet and his co-laborers of the *new regime* of their order, in the "Rockies" and on the Pacific coast, and this work still continues.

While the Chippewas of the lakes still had their homes in the regions of Lake Superior and adjacent waters, they were evangelized by Baraga and other seculars; and all this missionary work from its earliest period to modern times, including the Ottawa, the Pottawotomi and other nations of the lower lakes, has furnished Indian linguistic material for the "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages."

The manuscripts, as well as the printed works connected with the Eskimo, the Iroquoian, and the Siouan languages having already been noticed in our second article, as stated, will have no place in our present article.

The appearance of the manuscripts we are about to refer to indicate very clearly that not only was writing paper a very scarce commodity with the fathers in the missionary regions, but such paper as was available, which was of a poor quality, was economized to the greatest possible extent, its surface being closely covered on both sides of the leaves; poor as it is, it has stood the wear and use during centuries fairly well.

It is now quite yellow. Fortunately, the ink remains clear and black; and from what we have ourselves seen, and from what has been described by the compiler of these bibliographies, we conclude that the Jesuit fathers of North America prepared the ink they used from one general formula, which was probably in general use by the fathers of the Company of Jesus up to the close of the eighteenth century.

The manuscripts are generally in quarto form, about nine inches wide and twelve inches long. Most of those in the archives of the Archbishoprics of Quebec and Montreal, as also those in Laval and other Canadian universities, have been properly bound; and as a rule are in good condition. This may be said also of such of these manuscripts as are to be found in the private collections of Americana both in Canada and in the United States.

It is to be regretted that many of those preserved in some of the old Indian missionary centres of Canada, where they were probably originally compiled during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and where their continued use has been found necessary during all the nineteenth century, are unbound and in bad condition.

It would be, perhaps, advisable to have each collection catalogued and put in proper order, and after a vault had been provided in which they might be guarded against the accidents of the elements, the ravages of rats and mice, their custodians should be held accountable also for such as come under their control. Year after year some rare compositions have disappeared, and such losses may be charged to the cupidity of relic hunters.<sup>1</sup>

The gems in the Algonquian linguistic treasures are the dictionaries; these range generally in their contents from 500 double columns quarto pages to 900 and over; some more extensive have as many as 1800 pages in the aggregate of two or more volumes.

The Indian languages forming the subject for translation are the Abnaki, the Algonkin, the Illinois, the Micmac, the Montagnais, the Nipissing of the Abnaki family, and the Ottawa.

The people of these nations were mostly evangelized by Catholic missionaries during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some of them have occupied lower Canadian territory from times so remote that there is no genesis reliable.<sup>2</sup>

Their ancestors saw the Five Nations of the Iroquoians, while wanderers as they were from their original homes in the South in search of new homes in the North, build their cantons on the Island of Hochelaga, a century or more before the advent of Jacques Cartier; the Micmacs, whose homes and present condition were described in our third article; the Illinois whose nations have disappeared, and the Ottawa of the lakes, among whose tribes some of the most distinguished Catholic missionaries dwelt during the seventeenth, eighteenth and part of the nineteenth centuries.

The men of the latter nation were during its autonomy, down to the times of Pontiac, one of their famous rulers, considered the finest formed athletes of the North American Indian races.

It is evident that the compilation of an Indian-French dictionary, could only be made by a scholar proficient in the classical languages; proficient in the grammatical rules and signification of the words of the French language; after he had acquired a thorough knowledge of the roots of the indigenous language, the uses and meaning of the words, as well as of the gutturals, inseparably connected as these were, with the languages spoken by the North American Indians.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the most ancient of the manuscripts in the Seminary of Lac des Deux Montagnes (Oka), Canada, was a "Grammaire Algonquine," prepared by F. Robert Michael Gay, the first superior of the mission. It had additions of Algonkin names, with French translation by Father Maurice Quéré de Fiegunon, the second superior. This precious little work was seen and described later than 1882; but in 1889 it could not be found in the archives of the mission.

<sup>2</sup> See the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. xx., No. 78, April, 1895.

It would not be so difficult a task perhaps, for an average linguist to perform such work, while seated in his own cabinet, where all the works of reference he might need were within his reach ; or perhaps, for the modern American missionary, seated in his study, in the parsonage of the "mission," surrounded with civilized conveniences, with the agreeable warmth created by a stove and with his desk lighted by a students' lamp, while in an adjoining room, a wife, with her own or her husband's sister, made the situation more agreeable with vocal or instrumental music, for the piano or parlor-organ usually has a place in such households.

But the situation of the Indian missionary of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of the scholarly men who compiled these manuscript works, while engaged in such linguistic labor, was far different. If the missionary was so fortunate as to have a permanent residence so-called, with a chapel built of logs and roofed with bark, and a "mission house," though built of the same materials, he was fortunate if such mission centre, while in the forest regions of North America, was undisturbed by the vicinity of the white trader with his *fire-water* and adverse influence.

His home was not much better than the cabins of the chiefs and head men of the tribes with whom he lived and among whose people he ministered for their spiritual welfare. He lived like the people of his Indian constituency ; his daily food was of the same simple kind, and he practiced the same rules of charity and of hospitality, which were the second nature of the North American Indian, before he had been spoiled by contact with the whites.

Day and night his mission house was open to the wayfarer ; if he was hungry, he set before him the best food he had in his larder ; if he was thirsty, he gave him maple sap flavored with sassafras, and if he was weary and needed rest, the guest was given a couch of soft furs whereon to sleep ; and when he was rested, he was again refreshed with the missionary's fare, and he went on his way with the benediction of his apostolic host.

The latch string of the door of the missionary's home was ever unstrung.

Such however was the general custom in the primitive times of the North American Indian. At no hour of the day or the night, was the missionary's door closed to the messenger sent for religious ministration, or to the wayfarer who needed food and rest.

They were the teachers of the doctrines of the Catholic faith ; they found charity practically illustrated among the children of the forest and the lives they led exemplified the practice of Christian life.

Such were the authors, such the compilers, and such the surroundings of the Catholic missionaries whose Indian-French, and



Indian-Latin dictionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries excite our admiration at the present day. The question will arise in the minds of most readers: "how could these missionaries, whose lives were devoted to the spiritual welfare of their Christian constituency, which necessitated the performance of the sacred ceremonies, the visitations of the sick, the instruction of catechumens, the administration of the sacraments of baptism, marriage and extreme unction, the burial of the dead, besides the reading of their office and daily meditations, and the attention which had to be given to the consultations of the chiefs, and to the healing of dissensions among the families of their flocks,—find the time requisite for such dry and monotonous philological work as the compilation of an Indian dictionary required?"

The answer is given by the missionaries. As each letter of the alphabet was reached, the words, their uses and their signification were studied during their daily avocations and carefully noted.

Father Louis André, S.J., in his preface to the Algonquin manuscript dictionary, 1688, writes in his sixteenth paragraph of this preface:

"Il est bon d'avoir toujours dans sa poche un escritoire ou un crayon et des tablettes pour marquer tout ce que nous pourrez attrapper de ce qu'ils disent<sup>1</sup> et après nous proposerez à nostre<sup>2</sup> maistre ce que nous avez oui et marqué." (*Sic.*<sup>3</sup>)

Father Sebastian Rasles, S.J., writes: "On the 23d of July, 1689, I embarked at Rochelle; and after a tolerably good voyage of about three months, I arrived at Quebec in October of the same year. I at once applied myself to the study of the language of our Indians.

"It is very difficult; for it is not sufficient to study the words and their meaning, and to acquire a stock of words and phrases, but we must acquaint ourselves with the turn and arrangement of them, as used by the Indians; which can only be attained by intercourse and familiarity with them."

In 1691, Father Rasles wrote on the first leaf of the dictionary he had commenced:

"Il y a un an que je suis parmi les sauvages, et je commence à mettre en ordre en forme de dictionnaire les mots que j'apprens." When Father Rasles was slain by the English in 1724, the dictionary he had commenced thirty-three years previously was probably in progress of completion.

<sup>1</sup> Referring to the conversation of the Indians.

<sup>2</sup> Nostre maistre, has reference to the Indian mentor, selected to aid in the acquisition of the dialect.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, André-Père Louis, p. 13.

Here is another feature disclosed in the compilation of Indian-French dictionaries.

In the library of McGill College, Montreal, Canada, is preserved a manuscript French-Ottawa dictionary, the title of which, in Latin, reads: "Dictionarium Gallico 8ta8ka."<sup>1</sup> Mr. Pilling was at a loss to name the author or to fix the date of the compilation, and he applied to Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J., archivist of the College of St. Mary, Montreal. Father Jones is, probably, the best living authority on the manuscript *Jesuitana* of the old régime of his order in Canada. He named Father Pierre de Jaunay as the author of the dictionary, its date as 1741, and its compilation as having been completed at Michilimacinac. When asked by Mr. Pilling for his reasons, Father Jones replied:

"You ask me how I know that the Indian Dictionary at McGill College was the work of Father Du Jaunay. Here is positive evidence: The labor entailed in completing each letter has some special patron. He places the letter D under the protection of the Blessed Virgin while presenting Our Lord in the temple:

"D—Sub protectione Deiparae Virginis Filium suum offerentis, quod festum amabile ante hos dies quindecim celebrabamus, quo die (2 Feb.) vota suae professionis emittebat carissimus socius meus P. de la Morinie; item sub protectione X<sup>ti</sup> a diabolo tentati et jejunantis, quae stupenda Domini Nostri Dei Hominis cras in evangelio legemus prima Quadragesimae Dominica,' etc.

"That is to say, he undertook the letter D on Saturday, the 18th day of February, 1741, fifteen days after the Feast of the Purification, 2d February, and on the eve of the first Sunday of Lent. Easter that year fell on the 2d of April, Ash Wednesday on the 15th of February, and the first Sunday of Lent on February 19th.

"I have in my possession the official record of Father de la Morinie's last vows on profession. They were taken at St. Ignace, Michilimacinac, on the 2d of February, 1741, in presence of Father Du Jaunay, his companion in that mission."<sup>2</sup>

It was probably during the dreary months of the Canadian winters, when few wayfarers were likely to pull the latch-string of the missionary's door—for the trails, the Indians' highways, were covered with deep snow—that in the mornings, between the angelus, at half-past four, and the celebration of Mass in the chapel, a couple of hours were devoted to the work of writing out the notes which may have been taken; and again, at night, by the light of an unsavory fish-oil lamp, the work was resumed, and, with the aid of the Indians selected to assist, the words con-

<sup>1</sup> The figure 8 was used by the missionaries to denote the guttural oua, as in oua-toua, meaning Ottawa.

<sup>2</sup> *Algonquian Bibliography*, p. 260.

nected with each letter of the alphabet were permanently written in the Indian-French dictionary. If the missionary, as was the rule in permanent missions, had for his assistant a lay brother, the latter, usually well educated, rendered assistance in the compilation of the French words, and by the combined efforts of the Indian mentors, this philological work progressed year by year, until the dictionary was completed.

These dictionaries were compiled for the benefit of missionaries who were to succeed the authors in their apostolic work, to facilitate the acquisition of the Indian dialects, a practical knowledge of which was essential to successful work among the Indian population.

In 1851-53 Bishop Baraga, having evangelized the Indians of the lakes, made his home at L'Anse, and completed his famous grammar and dictionary of the Chippewa language—"perhaps," it is claimed, "the most important contribution to Indian philology made hitherto."<sup>1</sup>

The Very Rev. Edward Jacker, Vicar-General of Bishop Baraga and the friend and companion of the Bishop, undertook, after the death of the latter, the work of correcting and amplifying Bishop Baraga's Chippewa-English dictionary, which, from his thorough knowledge of the Chippewa language, he was enabled to complete after twenty years' continuous labor. Unfortunately, the result of this life's work, it may be said, was destroyed by an accident, by which he lost his canoe and its contents in Lake Michigan.

Unlike the work of the missionaries in the compilations they intended for the aid of their successors during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Baraga-Jacker Chippewa dictionary was designed to perpetuate the language of the Chippewas, whom General Cass claimed to have been the greatest of the Algonquian nations, and among whom, in remote times, had been centred the intelligence as well as the greatest power of the North American Indian nations. Father Jacker, a man of our own times and a profound student of Indian philology, is mentioned in this connection to give some idea of *the number of years* which may be absorbed in the linguistic labor of the compilation of an Indian dictionary.

We give in alphabetical order the names of the missionaries who have been positively identified as the authors of many of the Indian manuscripts extant in America, as well as in Europe, which are described in the Algonquian bibliography, in so far as these works relate to Algonquian nations. The missionary period in America is given as near as can be ascertained. Fathers :

---

<sup>1</sup> *Appleton's Cyclop. of Am. Biog.*

- Allouez, Claude, S.J., 1665-1689.  
 André, Louis, S.J., 1669-1715.  
 Aubéry, Joseph, S.J., 1694-1755.  
 Bellenger, Joseph Mary, Abbé, 1790.  
 Bigot, Vincent, S.J., 1680- .  
 Crespeuil, Francis X., S.J., 1676-1690.  
 Favre, Bonaventure, S.J., 1679-1693.  
 Gravier, James, S.J., 1684-1708.  
 Du Jaunay, Peter, S.J., 1728-1755.  
 Laure, Peter, S.J., 1720-1731.  
 Le Boulanger, Joseph Ignatius, S.J., 1700-1744.  
 Lesueur, Francis Eustache, S.J., 1716-1753.  
 Maillard, Abbé Anthony S., 1738-1768.  
 Marest, Gabriel, S.J., 1676-1702.  
 Masse, Enemond, S.J., 1611-1646.  
 Mathevet, John Claude, C.S.S., 1740-1781.  
 Meurin, Louis Sebastian, S.J., 1743-1778.  
 Maurice, John Baptist, S.J., 1734-1746.  
 Nicolas, Louis, S. J., 1664-1675.  
 Rasles, Sebastian, S. J., 1689-1724.  
 Silvy, Anthony, S.J., 1671-1707.  
 Vaultier, Peter, S.J., 1676-1691.  
 Virot, Claude Francis, S.J., 1750-1759.  
 White, Andrew, S.J., 1640- .

Father Allouez wrote for the use of Father Marquette, prayers, instructions, and a catechism in the Illinois language, in 1673, which is minutely described by Mr. Pilling.<sup>1</sup> This manuscript, when described for the latter, by the Abbé Sasseville, of St. Foye, Canada, was owned by Surgeon Major Hubert Neilson, Kingston, Canada.

Father André compiled his "Dictionnaire Algonquin" in 1688; his sermons in the Montagnais, and instructions for the use of missionaries, a few years later; and his homilies in the Montagnais language in 1672. These three manuscripts are now in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal.

Father Aubéry, missionary with the Abnakis, at St. Francis de Sales, now Pierreville, Canada, toward the close of the seventeenth century, compiled his first "Dictionnaire Française-Abnakis," 540 quarto pages, of which Judge Charles Gill writes: "This dictionary is a work which has required immense labor and a Benedictine patience." A later dictionary in the same languages, of 927 pages in double columns, was compiled later, but is not complete.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Algonquin Bibliography*, pp. 10-11.

Father Aubéry also wrote in Abnaki the "Chant Liturgique," a work of 577 quarto pages.

In addition to the three manuscripts described above, which are in the archives of the St. Francis Mission, there are six others in the library of the Archbishopric of Quebec, and described by Mr. Pilling, who quotes from Abbé Maurault:<sup>1</sup>

"Father Aubéry was ordained at Quebec, September 21, 1699, and was employed on the Abnaki missions. In 1709, he was ordered to St. Francis, and remained at that mission until his death, which occurred in 1755. He was well versed in the Abnaki language." "He wrote much, and nearly always in that language. By arduous and persevering labor during forty-six years, he formed a considerable collection of valuable manuscripts. As these were deposited in the church with the registers of the mission, they were unfortunately destroyed in 1759 in the incendiary burning of that church."

The Abbé Joseph Bellenger wrote in Micmac sermons and instructions for the use of missionaries; his manuscript, which is in the library of the Archbishopric of Quebec, is in quarto, about 300 pages. In the same library is a manuscript work by Father Vincent Bigot, in Abnaki-French, prayers, about 600 pages, written 1684-1686.

In the same library, is a similar work in Abnaki, Algonquin, Montagnais, and Esquimaux, by Father Francis Xavier de Crespiul, written in 1676.

In the library of Laval University, Quebec, is a manuscript of about 400 octavo pages, a Montagnais-French dictionary, written in 1689, by Father Bonaventure Favre.

In the library of Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn., is a manuscript Illinois-French dictionary, by Father James Gravier, which was probably written about the time the latter missionary succeeded Father Allouez as superior of the Illinois mission, which is said to have been in 1690.

Dr. Trumbull is considered a high authority in American-Indian

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire des Abnakis depuis 1605 jusqu'à nos jours.* Par l'Abbé J. A. Maurault. Quebec, 1866.

<sup>2</sup> Captain Rogers, a "border ruffian," with a company of "rangers," freebooters like himself, from the Mohawk Valley, without specific authority from General Amherst, raided the Abnaki mission of St. Francis.

Rogers stole the silver statue of St. Francis de Sales, greatly venerated by the Indians, and the sacred vessels from the altars; after plundering the mission, the church and the mission establishment were set on fire, and, with the registers and a priceless collection of manuscripts, entirely destroyed.

This was the only act of vandalism which stained the record of the campaigns of Wolf and Amherst in the conquest of Canada. But it was an unauthorized piece of guerilla brigandage.

philology. His description of the manuscript, which he furnished Mr. Pilling,<sup>1</sup> is quite interesting; as are likewise the other notes on this distinguished Jesuit.

We have already described when and where the Ottawa-Latin dictionary in the library of McGill College, Montreal, was compiled by Father Peter du Jaunay.

Father Peter Laure, who had charge of the Saguenay mission from 1720 until his death in 1738, left several manuscripts in the Montagnais language, among which are a Montagnais grammar and dictionary. It is uncertain where the latter works are at the present time.

Mr. Pilling describes three which are in the library of the Archbishopric of Quebec, in the Montagnais text, designed to aid priests in their missionary labors among the people of this nation. In this connection, it would be advisable to consult, as to Father Laure, the work of Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J., on the Saguenay mission.<sup>2</sup>

Of Father Joseph Ignatius Boulanger's French-Illinois dictionary, Dr. Shea is quoted:<sup>3</sup>

"A manuscript dictionary exists of the Illinois language, which, in extent and careful preparation, exceeds any work known on any of the Algonquian dialects. It is to all appearance the work of the Jesuit Father Le Boulanger, whose labors on the Illinois language are highly extolled in the "*Lettres Edifiantes*." The Illinois have now disappeared, but, for purposes of research and study, their language is one of the most interesting of the various dialects of the widespread Algonquian. They were on the extreme southwest, and were separated on the east by the Iroquoians from the Delawares, and had on the west the Dakota tribes. Their language, as shown in this dictionary throws much light on western names of tribes, rivers, lakes, etc., and by contrast with that of the kindred Lenni or Delawares, as preserved by the Moravians, furnishes the amplest known material for the study of the Algonquian languages."

For a more extended account of Father Le Boulanger's works, consult page 303 of Pilling's "*Algonquian Bibliography*."

Father Francis Eustache Lesueur compiled a dictionary of the roots of the Abnaki language; the manuscript, compiled between the years 1716-1753, is in quarto, 900 pages, and is preserved in the archives of the mission of St. Francis, with other manuscripts written by the same Jesuit missionary.

<sup>1</sup> *Algonquian Bibliography*, etc., pp. 211-212.

<sup>2</sup> *Documents Rares ou Inédits, Mission du Saguenay, etc.* Par le Père Arthur E. Jones, S. J. Montreal, Archives du Collège Ste. Marie. 1889.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 302.

The Abbé Anthony Maillard, who served as a missionary in Acadia, composed a Micmac grammar of 184 quarto pages, which was in the library of Dr. John G. Shea. Many other manuscripts written by the Abbé Maillard are extant.

Father Gabriel Marest wrote a catechism and collection of prayers, while serving as a missionary among the Illinois in 1699, in the Illinois language. He had a good knowledge of this language, and was able to instruct the Jesuit fathers who came to share his labor. He was also the author of other translations designed to aid missionary work in the Illinois regions. He made a journey to Hudson Bay in 1694 in company with Iberville.

The Sulpitian missionary, Father John Paul Mathevet, who was at the mission of the Lake of the Two Mountains (Oka) from 1746 to 1781, left several manuscript works in the Nipissing dialect of the Abnaki family and a small Abnaki-French dictionary. All his manuscripts are at the Oka mission.

Another eminent Jesuit, and among the last of the fathers of the old *régime*, was Sebastian Louis Meurin, regarding whom Mr. Pilling quotes: "In Morse J.—, 'Report to the Secretary of War,' p. 144, will be found the following note: 'The Rev. Father Meurin died at Prairie du Rocher, 45 miles below St. Louis, 15 above Kaskaskias, on the Mississippi, in the year 1778. He was the last of the Jesuits in this country.'<sup>1</sup> He was ordered home; but at the request of the Indians he returned and died with them. He was a very learned man, and has left a valuable library and a manuscript 'dictionary' of the Indian and French languages in twenty-four volumes. He was missionary to Illinois Indians, and was respected and beloved by them as a very pious and faithful missionary.'<sup>2</sup>"

The report of Mr. Morse to the Secretary of War, while creditable to Father Meurin, is misleading so far as it relates to an Illinois-French dictionary of twenty-four volumes. No such manuscript, the work of Father Meurin, is extant, either in America or in Europe. The work was probably in twenty-four parts or divisions, and not in volumes. So extensive a work could not have remained hidden from the determined search of James Constantine Pilling.

That a French-Illinois dictionary in manuscript, the work of Father Meurin, has been among the contributions of the French Jesuit missionaries to the philology of the North American Indian nations is generally admitted; but, at the same time, we are forced to admit that the location or identification of the manuscripts of the learned missionary has so far proved futile.

<sup>1</sup> Meaning the southwest probably.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 569.

But the name of Meurin is an index to several chapters in the history of the eighteenth century, in connection with French Louisiana, prior to, and even just after the cession of what was comprised in Louisiana, to British rule. And these chapters are the chronicles of some of the shabbiest work of so-called French officials in their outrageous spoliation of religious establishments conducted by the Jesuit fathers, and their unlawful persecution of the latter.

Should the reader wish to read the history of these events he may consult "*Bannissement des Jésuites de la Louisiane*"; "*Mémoires Historique*," Dumont; "*Lettres Edifiantes*," Fr. Vivier; Kipp; and Dr. Shea, in "*The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*."

The reader will probably admit that the preservation of the linguistic works of the missionary fathers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when these works had been completed, after many years of tedious study and labor, was a difficult task, on account of adverse politico-religious interference, besides accidents of providential occurrence.

Father John Baptist Maurice, who was a missionary for five years at Tadoussac, has left a Montagnais manuscript of a series of sermons. The missionary died at his post in 1746, while yet young in sacerdotal life. His manuscript is in the library of the Archbishopric of Quebec.

Father Louis Nicolas, the elder of two brothers who were members of the Company of Jesus, and who came to America to serve as missionaries among the Indians, compiled an Algonquian grammar, in 1670, while at the mission of the Lake of the Two Mountains.

This grammar is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, numbered 1 in Catalogue 327, and minutely described.

The dictionary of Father Sebastian Rasles, the martyr to Puritan fanatic hatred of the sacerdotal element of the Catholic faith, has been widely noticed.

This manuscript, "*Dictionary of the Abnaki Language of North America*," is regarded as one of the brightest gems in the linguistic collection of Harvard College. How many brilliant minds among the Puritan students of this American Athenæum have been, by the study of this manuscript of Father Rasles, tempted to taste of the forbidden fruit and to "read up" the Roman Catholic religion, would be a difficult calculation. We do know, however, that among the distinguished converts who have had the happiness to submit their minds to the requirements of the Church of Jesus Christ, and to enjoy that abiding faith, which can only be enjoyed within Her fold, during the past half century, none have been more faithful, none have been more consistent Christians than



those whose Puritanic lineage is clear and well-defined. Here is the notice of another dictionary by a Jesuit missionary, which connects with a history by no means creditable to the representatives of British power on North American soil: <sup>1</sup> Father Anthony Silvy, "Dictionary of the Montagnais Language, 1678-1688."

Here is what Mr. Pilling has to say of this work: "Manuscript, 104 leaves, 12mo., of the seventeenth century. Alphabetically arranged, irregularly paged; some leaves numbered, others not. The handwriting is extremely small and fine, but fairly legible. The margins are covered with signs and points, such as crosses, bars, angles, etc.; but there is no key to these to determine their meaning. Bound in caribou leather. In 1885, I was furnished by the Abbé Sasseville, of St. Foy, Quebec, with a minutely-detailed description of the above manuscripts and of one by Père Allouez (*q.v.*), both belonging to Surgeon-Major Neilson, of Kingston, Canada."

Since then these descriptions have been published (see Sasseville, J., and Shea, J. G.), and from that publication I have condensed the above and made the following extracts:

"The manuscript is of particular interest to those philologists who devote themselves to the study of the primitive languages spoken by the Indians of North America."

"It belonged formerly to the library of the Jesuits in their ancient college at Quebec. When in 1800 the British government took possession of their property after the death of the last survivor of the Jesuit order in Canada, Father Casot, their library was sold at auction, and the Honorable John Neilson became the purchaser of a number of volumes, among which was found, by a happy accident, the manuscript by Allouez, and the Montagnais Dictionary, not less precious. There is no date or hint as to the date, when the manuscript was composed. But in following the career of Father Silvy, it may be assumed that this work was done during his stay in the Montagnais missions of Tadoussac and Hudson Bay, since this dictionary reproduces the language of his neophytes. The date of this manuscript may therefore with some reason be placed between the years 1678 and 1688."<sup>2</sup>

In the library of the Archbishopric of Quebec, there is a quarto manuscript of about eighty pages, of "Instructions Montagnaises," with Latin titles. The sermons in Montagnais are on the left of a line, and a French translation on the right. This work is in the handwriting of Father Silvy, and was probably written at the Tadoussac mission about the year 1680.

<sup>1</sup> It would be well to consult Dr. Shea's *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days, in re Silvy*, p. 278-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 462.

In the same library are two manuscripts by Father Peter Vaultier, a Jesuit missionary among the Montagnais, one of which bears the title, "Chants religieux en Montagnais." It is a work of about forty small quarto pages; there is another of about one hundred and thirty 12mo pages, with this title: "Hic precum, catecheseos, hymnorum liber lingua Algonica, descriptus est a R. P. Vaultier, S.J., 1676."

The manuscript is bound in caribou and is very well preserved.

The manuscript of another Jesuit missionary, Father Claude Francis Virot, in the Abnaki language, being a series of instructions for missionary use, is in the archives of the mission of St. Francis at Pierreville, Canada. The most ancient of all the linguistic productions of Jesuit missionaries in America, is probably that of Father Andrew White, which Mr. Pilling notes, as: "Grammar, dictionary, and catechism in the language of the Maryland Indians."<sup>1</sup> "Father White labored among the Piscatawas, and these works were probably in their language," says Dr. Shea. "When Rev. Father William McSherry found White's *Relatio Itineris* in the archives of the Professed House of the Jesuits at Rome, about 1832, an Indian catechism accompanied that document. A copy of it was promised me, but in the troubles in Italy the valuable papers were boxed up and stored for safety."<sup>2</sup>

Father White, an English Jesuit, who had been banished from England, had filled professors' chairs in several colleges on the continent. When the expedition of Lord Baltimore to Maryland was being organized in 1633, Father White's provincial appointed him superior of missionary work under the auspice of Lord Baltimore.

He, with Father John Altham, another English Jesuit, and a lay brother, Thomas Gervase, sailed with Lord Baltimore's expedition from Cowes in November, 1633, and landed on American soil in March, 1634.

From his ordination in France in 1605, till his death in England in 1656, the career of Father White was both romantic and adventurous. His early experience in England brought imprisonment and exile. His learning earned for him professional honors on the continent, while in America his name is connected with that of Lord Baltimore and the foundation of the Church in Maryland.

Of the more valuable and extensive manuscripts written during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which have been described by Mr. Pilling, as appertaining to the Algonquian languages, there

<sup>1</sup> "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages," p. 525.

<sup>2</sup> It will interest the reader to consult Dr. Shea's "*The Catholic Church in Colonial Times*," pp. 40-2, 44-9, 53-4 and 64, in relation to Father White, as well as the authorities therein quoted.

are 22 dictionaries, 14 grammars, 16 catechisms, 19 collections of sermons, 18 rituals of prayers, litanies, and acts of devotion, 5 gospel and scriptural lessons, 9 hymnals and canticles, and 7 instructions intended expressly for the use of missionaries in the administration of the sacraments.

Only fourteen of the dictionaries can be positively traced to their compilers.

But besides the works designated, there are many duplicates and triplicates of the most useful, made principally during the eighteenth century and not included in the numbers of the originals.

It is a notable fact, that the greater number of the most extensive of these manuscript works, are written in the languages of Indian nations existing at the present day, whose people may be claimed to be solidly Catholic, who have been under the spiritual guidance of Catholic missionaries from the early decades of the seventeenth century down to the present time. This is proved by the fact that there are 51 written works in the Abnaki language proper ;<sup>1</sup> 69 in the Algonkin and Abnaki families of dialects ; 33 in the Micmac language, and 17 in the Montagnais dialects of the Indians in the Tadoussac region.

Of the languages of other nations who may not be Catholic at the present time as solidly as those above named, there are 9 in the Ottawa, 6 in the Menominee, 7 in the Pottawotomi, 4 in the Chipewewa, 1 each in the Cheyenne and the Cree, 5 in the Blackfoot, 1 in the Passamaquoddy and 1 in the Mississauga languages. Then there are the Moravian converts' languages, of which there are 3 in the language of the remnants of the Mohegans, 2 of the Delawares and 2 of the Shawnees.

Of the languages of the partially extinct Algonquian nations, the most extensive and valuable relate to the Illinois, of which there are nine, written, mostly during the seventeenth century, by Catholic missionaries. There are three unimportant works in the Massachusetts dialects, and the fragmentary manuscripts of Thomas Jefferson. Besides these, there are the Catechism, grammar, and dictionary of the Jesuit Father Andrew White, written in the languages of the Pautuxent and Piscataway extinct nations of Maryland, as described, in the early part of the seventeenth century.

When we attempt to locate and to mention the present custodians of the manuscripts we have been considering, we cannot re-

<sup>1</sup> Writing of the Abnaki language proper, Father Vetromile (Eugene), of Biddeford, Maine, in 1875, says: "I do not know of any language of my knowledge, the Greek and Latin included, that could express the form of baptism in a theological point of view as the Indian (Abnaki) does."

frain from again expressing our admiration of the compiler of these Indian bibliographies, James Constantine Pilling. It is truly wonderful, particularly in regard to manuscripts, which, unlike printed books, are most difficult to trace, for there may be hundreds of copies and in different languages and editions of a printed work, but there can be but one original manuscript as a rule. How well he has succeeded in gaining the knowledge of the location and the contents of the written works described by him in this bibliography!

Before we attempt to describe the location, the depositories, and the present custodians of the manuscripts described, we beg to recall the attention of our readers to the fact that they have relation only to the languages of the Algonquian nations; and that they are entirely distinct from the manuscripts of the Iroquoian nations which have been described in a previous article,<sup>1</sup> many of which are unique and precious, especially those relating to the missions of Huronia and to the Iroquoian missions of New York during the seventeenth century.

In the archives of the Archbishopric of Quebec there are thirty-three or more manuscripts in the Algonquian languages, with translations and notes in French and Latin.

In the library of the University of Laval there are fourteen. At Oka,<sup>2</sup> mission of the Lac des Deux Montagnes, where for nearly two and a half centuries the Abnaki and Iroquoian Indians have lived and died in the Catholic faith, there are fifty-eight or more manuscripts in the language of the Abnaki's and of kindred tribes of this nationality. At the mission of St. Francis at Pierreville, an Abnaki mission, whose origin dates from the middle period of the seventeenth century, thirteen manuscripts only are all that remain of the precious works gathered there and destroyed by the torch of the English border ranger, Rogers.<sup>3</sup>

The great linguist, Cardinal Mezzofanti, gave some attention to the study of the Indian languages of North America. He had collected a number of manuscripts written in these languages, and of those of the Algonquian nations nine are in the Biblioteca Comunale at Bologna. Others are in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome, in the library of the University of Bologna, and in other Italian libraries. Included in the collection of the cardinal is an unfinished dictionary, of which there are more than 10,000 slips.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. xviii., No. 72, p. 698, October, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Oka is about 42 miles from Montreal, and is reached in summer by boat from the latter city; a visit to this ancient Indian mission will amply reward the tourist.

<sup>3</sup> The St. Francis mission may be reached in summer by boat from Montreal. It is a place of resort by Montreal people and a picturesque region.

There are four Algonquian manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, one of which is claimed to have been written as early as 1613,<sup>1</sup> but the author is unknown.

There were, undoubtedly, many valuable manuscripts among the collections of the Jesuits, whose property and library at Rome was sequestered in 1773, the location of which remains to be discovered. The manuscripts of Father White, which we have mentioned as having been "boxed up and removed to a place of safety" during the Italian troubles of 1832; the loss of President Jefferson's manuscripts; the capsizing of Father Jacker's canoe in Lake Michigan, by which his Chippewa manuscript revision of Baraga's dictionary, upon which he had labored for twenty years, was lost; and the burning of Father Aubéry's collection of fifty years at the mission of St. Francis at Pierreville, Canada, are incidents illustrating the dangers to which manuscript property may be exposed.

A very important collection of the manuscripts of the Jesuits of the ancient *régime* of Canada is probably in the archives of the Jesuit College of St. Mary, Montreal.

Father Arthur E. Jones, archivist, has been, as stated, for some years at work on a history of his order in Canada, from the earliest period to the death of Father Casot, last of his illustrious line, in 1800.

When this work appears we may learn many facts, in this connection, heretofore unpublished. We were shown by Father Jones, three years ago, some rare manuscripts, among which were the maps outlined by Father Marquette and others during the seventeenth century.

The McGill College of Montreal has two manuscripts, one of which, by Father Du Jaunay, we have described. The Séminaire St. Nicolet, at Montreal, has two, and the Public Library at Toronto two.

These are probably all the Canadian institutions possessing Algonquian manuscripts.

In the United States, one or more are in the libraries of Harvard, Lenox, American Phil. Society of Philadelphia, John Carter Brown Library; several in the Ethnological Bureau, Department of the Smithsonian Institution; others are owned by Major James W. Powell and the compiler, James Constantine Pilling, of the latter bureau; several in the library of Wilberforce Eames, Brooklyn; some rare and valuable are in the library of Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. G. B. Grinnell, of New York City; Rev. M. C. O'Brien, of Bangor, Maine; Colonel John Mason

---

<sup>1</sup> Rudiments of the Micmac language.

Brown, of Louisville, Ky.; and Albert Gallatin, of New York. Many of the manuscripts mentioned above, however, are anonymous, but their origin can be traced to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Father Vetromile, of Biddeford, Maine, who is the author of several Indian Prayer-books in the languages of the Penobscot, the Micmac, the Abnaki, and the Etchemin Indians of Maine, living in the communion of the Catholic Church, has had, during his philological and missionary labors, in his possession, temporarily, several ancient manuscripts, but these have probably been described in the foregoing notices.<sup>1</sup>

It is to the credit of the Catholic Church that the first collegiate institution established in North America was the Jesuit College, of Quebec, which was founded in 1635, one year before that of Harvard. The site of this establishment was on an elevated position, comprising six acres, overlooking the surroundings, both land and waters.

It may be claimed for this ancient seat of learning, that it was the cradle of the civilization and evangelization of the Algonquian nations of the east, and many of the west and northwest.

Under its roof had been arranged many important treaties, which were subsequently elaborated, ratified and confirmed by ruling Indian nations and the Governor-General of New France. From the portals of this college went forth the pioneer Jesuit explorers and missionaries, whose discoveries made known to the world the great regions of the west and southwest, which constitute at the present day so much of the realm of the American Republic. For a century or more the College of Quebec was the abode of many of the most distinguished scholars of that early epoch in North American history, of venerable priests, and of heroic missionaries.

It became, in time, the nursery of the priesthood of the See of Quebec; and in it was spent the probationary terms of some of the members of the Company of Jesus, who had come to America before their ordination.

In its library was deposited the reports, maps, and the written details of missionary work during the first century of its existence, which included the most important periods in the history of this work.

With the conquest of Canada, a century and a quarter after the foundation of the college, the political control of New France re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Pilling devotes five octavo pages to the description of the religious books published by Father Vetromile in the language of the Indian nations named in the text. Dating from 1856 until 1880, there are eight of these books. In connection with Vetromile, see Fr. Ciquard, pp. 556, 557, in addenda of *Algonquian Bibliography*.

verted to an alien power bitterly opposed to the Catholic Church, and especially to the Jesuit order.

After Amherst had completed this conquest and had returned to England, he petitioned George III. for a grant of the estates of the Jesuits in Canada as a reward for his services to the British Crown. Although favorably inclined, the monarch did not readily accede to Amherst's request; but in 1770, upon a renewal of his petition, the King referred the matter to the Royal Council, who reported favorably, and a grant was authorized of what might be legally granted.

This action brought the question before the law lords, who were in no haste to carry out his Majesty's wishes, and who called for reports and details from Canada.

In the meantime Amherst continued to petition the King, and after eighteen years' delay, a royal commission was appointed in Canada to ascertain what part of the estates might be available for a grant. To expedite the work of this commission, Amherst agreed to pay all its expenses. This was in 1788.

The general died, however, without having obtained the coveted prize, but his family continued to urge the claim. In face of the treaty of the cession of Canada, confiscation of property devoted to educational and religious purposes could not be legally accomplished; under the pressure of adverse influence brought to bear upon the king however, the dishonorable project of procuring possession of the estates by escheat to the Crown, was inaugurated by inhibiting the Jesuits in Canada to add to their number, so that when the last survivor would have ceased to exist, the officers of the crown would take possession of all their estates.

The days of the College of Quebec were thus numbered; and as early as 1778 the fathers were obliged to suspend their classes outside, and their archives were all concentrated in the college.

The dawn of the nineteenth century opened with but a solitary Jesuit left at the college or in Canada; this was the venerable Father John Joseph Casot, who was rector and father superior of himself, but administrator and controller of the estates of his order in Canada, estimated to be worth at the time over \$2,000,000. Father Casot had made a generous use of the surplus income of the property under his control, and for years his donations for charitable and religious purposes in Quebec and Montreal had been extensive. He was very old, and with the month of March, 1800, his earthly career was apparently approaching its term. In the meantime the minions of the law in Quebec were keenly watching the flickering light soon to be extinguished, but, impatient to secure the spoils, they would not permit the venerable missionary to depart in peace, but with indecent haste the High

Sheriff of Quebec invaded the college on March 8th and placed seals upon its contents and effects, not sparing the room in which the last survivor of his order of the old *régime* was lying while calmly awaiting his call to his eternal reward. This came March 16, 1800. All the property of the Jesuits in Canada was taken possession of by the officers of the crown, but the family of Lord Amherst never realized a dollar out of the spoil. No more unsavory chapters in the history of British rule in Canada can be found than the proceedings, which in their process destroyed the oldest institution of learning in North America; deprived the Indian nations of their most influential missionaries, and diverted from their prescribed uses the lands and properties donated by generous and pious individuals for the education of Canadian and Indian youth. The professional integrity of the Law Lords and the firm stand taken by British statesmen to uphold the honor of the British government by adhering to the principles of the treaty guaranteeing the freedom of the Catholic religion to the conquered people of Canada, thwarted the intrigues of bigots and boodlers during thirty years. The official documents and collateral history of this period have been carefully transcribed, and these are on file, and may be consulted in the archives of the Dominion of Canada at Ottawa.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It may prove agreeable to our readers, if we divert their attention from the main subject of this article, while we recall an incident which occurred at a corresponding period with the events we have just related. It is a notable example of the equitable dealing of British merchants, having no sympathy with the Catholic Church nor with the members of the Company of Jesus. For two centuries the British East India Company was the financial power of the commerce of the East.

It was the trust company whose fiduciary operations embraced billions of capital, and whose record is comparatively free from serious blemish. It was one of the greatest financial powers of the eighteenth century and controlled by British merchants in London.

We quote from the historian of the Jesuit order:

"Les Jesuites en Chine étaient missionnaires et astronomes; ils travaillaient au salut des âmes et à la conquête des sciences.

"Les Frères coadjuteurs de l'ordre devinrent médecins. Bernard Rhodes et Pierre Fraperie se distinguèrent surtout dans cette faculté. Ils avaient commencé par les pauvres; leur réputation grandit comme leur charité; et lorsque l'empereur se trouva dans un état désespéré, les médecins Chinois eurent recours à Rhodes, comme au dernier moyen de l'art. Il traita Kang Hi, il lui rendit la santé. Le monarque était généreux, enfin de reconnaître un pareil bienfait il envoya aux Jésuites des lingots d'or dont la vente produisit une somme de deux cent mille francs. La destinée de cette argent à quelque chose de si honorable pour la Compagnie anglaise des Indes, que nous croyons devoir raconter le fait en peu des mots. Les supérieurs des Missions avaient placé cette somme sur la Compagnie anglaise, à la seule condition que la rente annuelle serait appliquée à tous Jésuites de Chine et des Indes que se trouveraient dans le besoin.

"Au moment de la destruction de l'ordre de Jésus, la Compagnie anglaise fut tentée de suivre l'exemple que les princes catholiques lui donnaient; elle confisqua les 200,-



It has been stated that three valuable manuscripts are in the possession of surgeon-major Neilson, of Kingston, Canada ; these were purchased by his father, the Honorable John Neilson, with a number of other works, when the library of the college of Quebec was sold at auction by the sheriff, in 1800. We have also mentioned that many ancient missionary manuscripts are held as heirlooms by old families in Canada, and we thus end our description of the depositories of the Algonquian manuscripts, as far as has been ascertained.

The sale of the archives and library of the College of Quebec occurred at a period in the history of the Catholic Church when most of her opponents, and probably a considerable number within her fold, believed that her dissolution was imminent. The armed heel of Napoleon was upon the neck of her venerable Pontiff. The autonomy of the Papal States had been ended by the French conqueror, whose soldiers from the faubourgs of Paris ruled Rome. The learned bibliophiles and collectors of *Americana* of modern times had not been born, and there was no eager crowd of intelligent purchasers assembled to dispute for the acquisition of the rare books and rarer manuscripts which made up the most valuable collection of *Americana* the world has ever known.

It is sad to reflect how widely this collection of American missionary and scientific lore was scattered ; for there is reliable evidence that such was the result of this sale. Nor is it improbable that the quarto leaves of Indian philological manuscripts served the épicier of Quebec for years to wrap his sugar, his candles and his soap, when these were sold to his customers ; that the octavo

ooo francs, et cessa d'en servir les intérêts, pour les consacrer à l'entretien des hospitaux. Les Jésuites étaient supprimés comme société, mais, individuellement ils se livraient aux soins de l'apostolat dans les Indes. Ils nommèrent un député pour réclamer à Londres auprès de la cour des directeurs. Leurs réclamations furent accueillies avec sollicitude, et les directeurs écrivirent à leurs mandataires que si les autres gouvernements avaient commis une faute grave contre le droit des gens, ce n'était pas une raison pour la Compagnie des Indes de les imiter en violant les engagements les plus sacrés."

"Les directeurs ajoutaient qu'en considération des services que les Jésuites de Pondichéry rendaient à leurs Indiens et aux Anglais, la Compagnie avait décidé que la somme serait conservée intacte, et la rente exactement payée jusqu'à la mort du dernier missionnaire Jésuite.

"Elle ordonnait en même temps le remboursement des trois années d'arrearages. Ainsi, les Hérétiques croyaient, autant dans l'intérêt de l'humanité que dans celui de la justice, devoir laisser aux enfants de Loyola, leurs adversaires la fortune dont les souverains catholiques les dépouillaient. En 1813, tous les Jésuites de Péking et de Pondichéry étant morts la Propagande de Rome décida, malgré les instances de la Congrégation des Missions Etrangères, que cette somme serait appliquée aux Lazaristes de la Chine."

"*Histoire Religieuse Politique et Littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus.* J. Crétineau-Joly, Tome v., deuxième édition. Paris, p. 42."

and smaller leaves were used to light the fires during winter mornings, or to be used by the barber on which to wipe the lather from his razor while performing his tonsorial art upon the faces of the officers of the garrison of Quebec.

How much of this literary material was picked up by peddlers from "the States," and carried to the paper mills on the Genesee and Mohawk Rivers, is uncertain; but it was probably considerable, as some of it was found and identified. One fact tells of the general result, and this fact is, that the number of books or manuscripts whose original custody may be traced to the library of the College of Quebec is decidedly small.<sup>1</sup>

The "Bibliography of the Algonquian Language" is, in our opinion, the greatest of Pilling's works. It is comprehensive from the beginning of the seventeenth century down to 1891. It is

<sup>1</sup> The College of Quebec had long been used as a soldiers' barracks, having in one corner the office of the town major, and the officers of the garrison had their library adjoining. The Honorable P. B. Casgrain, M.P., of Quebec, wrote us, March 17, 1890, that twelve views of the principal buildings in Quebec were, by Act of Parliament, taken in 1761. These were 20 by 12½ inches large, and include the Jesuits' college and church. "The college," he writes, "was demolished in 1878, under the de Boucherville ministry. Lieutenant-Governor Létellier de Saint Just, who was opposed to this act of vandalism, caused a plan of the college to be drawn before its demolition." The views referred to by Mr. Casgrain are in the library of the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa.

Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J., of Montreal, states that the destruction of the college was effected by a series of intrigues, the true motives of which were held back, and the vain pretext that it was dangerous was put forward.

He subsequently quotes from M. Faucher de St. Maurice from his *Relation de ce qui s'est passé*, etc., Quebec, 1879," and who was an eye-witness to the whole proceedings. "Pendant quelques années, les murs silencieux du vieux collège des Jésuites semblèrent se recueillir, jusqu'au jour où, la charité revenant frapper à la porte des cellules des pères, celles-ci se rouvrirent pour donner l'hospitalité à une partie de la population du quartier Montcalm, qu'un incendie venait de chasser de leurs demeures. Érigé pour venir en aide aux souffrances humaines, le collège finissait comme il avait commencé. Il redevenait l'asile des malheureux, et les pauvres y trouvèrent un abri, jusqu'à ce que certains philanthropes s'aperçurent que ses murailles étaient dilapidées et dirent qu'elles menaçaient la vie des passants.

Il fallait alors en finir au plus vite. La bande noire s'abattit sur cette relique de notre passé. Mais, chose étrange! Ces pierres branlantes, condamnées comme étant dangereuses résistèrent à la sape et à la mine. Le bélier, la poudre à canon mordirent à peine dans ces assises, où le mortier avait la consistance du granit.

On employa les plus forts exploisibles connus pour avoir raison de ces murs, et encore la maçonnerie des frères Le Fauconier, la charpente du frère Ambroise Cauvet, ne semblèrent s'écrouler qu'à regret, mettant à découvert des ossements que des rapprochements de faits et des coïncidences historiques semblent identifier avec ceux du frère Jean Liégois, le grand architecte qui avait eu la surintendance du tout, et à qui pendant 214 ans, son œuvre aurait ainsi servi de tombeau.

Dans quelques jours, il ne restera plus rien de ce qui fut, pendant 114 ans, l'Alma Mater de l'instruction dans l'Amérique du Nord. Plus vieux d'une année que le collège de Harvard, près de Boston, celui des Jésuites de Québec n'existera plus maintenant que dans les esprits de ceux qui ont la fierté de leur passée.

destined to perpetuate his name in American literature more effectively than any monument in stone the sculptor's art could design. It was during the compilation of this work that Mr. Pilling's health was seriously affected; that, in fact, he became a physical wreck, and doomed to a premature grave. Pilling's work was well done; and it remained with the director of the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution to produce this work in such a manner as its importance deserved. Major James W. Powell, upon whom devolved this responsibility, has, we are reluctant to believe, permitted anti-Catholic prejudice to rule, where fairness and justice should have prevailed. All these Indian bibliographies are illustrated, more or less, with fac-similes, which are creditable examples of the work of the skilled artists, and the perfect apparatus at the command of the bureau. In the Algonquian there are eighty-two fac-similes. Fifty-three of these represent the title-pages and specimen leaves of printed books appertaining to the Puritanic era of missionary labor among the thirty-two Indian nations of New England, and pointing to the dismal failure of this work, and the extinction of these unfortunate nations. There are other fac-similes of the title-pages of books connecting with more modern missionary work among the Algonquian nations, and many fine examples of the historical and geographical publications of the seventeenth century.

But in all these eighty-two illustrations of what belongs to Algonquian bibliography, there are only eight fac-similes of the title-pages or specimen leaves of the books of Catholic missionaries.

There are none of Baraga; there are none of Charlevoix, while the contemporary books of that Gascon renegade, Lahonton, has seven. There are none of Cuoq, De Jean, De Leage, Durocher or of Jacker. Nor of the "Relations" of Lejune, 1634, '35, '36; of Lescarbot, who was not a missionary, 1609; of Masse, of the Cramoisy titles of Dr. Shea, nor of his earlier works, nor of Vetro-mile. How attractive would have been these fac-similes had Major Powell reproduced one or more of the pages of Rasles' manuscript Abnaqui dictionary? Some specimen leaves from the Illinois dictionary, in the collection of Dr. Trumbull, of Hartford; some of the leaves of the quaint and ancient manuscripts in the archives of the Archbishopric of Quebec, and of the library of the University of Laval; of the most unique of such relics at the mission of Lac des deux Montagnes; and at the Abnaqui mission of St. Francis, at Pierreville. It would also be interesting to see a few leaves in the handwriting of Fathers Allouez and Silvy reproduced from the manuscripts in the possession of Surgeon Major Neilson, of Kingston. With the admirable facilities at the command of the

Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, exact fac-similes of these leaves could have been taken.

As these reproductions would have been studied, the personality of the learned and distinguished men who produced the originals, would be recalled to our minds more vividly, as also their surroundings, and the times and purpose of their labors.

While so much of this bibliography relates to the missionary works of the Catholic priests, and to the printed works of Catholic authors, the allotment of eight fac-similes out of eighty-two to the preponderating element originating the material, cannot be accounted for otherwise than we have reluctantly been compelled to claim.

Since we have written these lines, intelligence has come to us of the death of James Constantine Pilling, July 26, 1895, at his country home at Olney, Maryland, in his 49th year. If we have failed to accord him a greater measure of credit for his immortal works it has not been from want of appreciation, but because of the limited space at our disposal. May his soul rest in peace.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

---

### LEO XIII. AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH—RECENT WORK IN THE VATICAN LIBRARY.

THE development of historical science at the present epoch is simply amazing; indeed, it would be hard to decide whether the human mind is now more actively employed in turning the great modern discoveries to practical uses for the amelioration of our condition, or in endeavoring to solve the enigmas of the past. This activity is unparalleled in the annals of our race; it is at once to us a subject of admiration and a pledge of future progress.

In certain countries—France, for instance—there is, probably, not a single Department which is not provided with several *Comités Archéologiques*—unpretentious associations which publish a constant supply of monographs that, later on, will be invaluable to the writer of general history. Living in a generation to which the past has committed so many secrets, and proud of the progress we have made, we are desirous of measuring the distance already traversed, that we may thereby be cheered on to fresh conquests. Or, perhaps, having learned by experience that the vigorous minds of our fathers have not, after all, left everything to be done by us, we wish to become better acquainted with bygone times, with a view to imitate whatever excellence may be found in them; or it may be that, in our love of psychological problems, we affect the ability to penetrate into the intimate feelings of personages who have played a prominent part on the world's stage, and make them, so to say, live their lives over again together with us—in a word, we wish to deal with *men*, not simply string together a series of *facts*. Or, finally, it is, perhaps, that our thirst for truth of every kind, our familiarity with severer methods, and the more facile, certain and abundant means of investigation at our command, have caused us to introduce, here as elsewhere, greater precision, more rigid criticism and circumspection. Blind apologies and fanatical calumnies we reject with equal scorn, and to history, purified from the least trace of legend, we purpose to erect, on the basis of original documents, an enduring temple.

To facilitate and accelerate this wide survey of historical questions, governments have, in praiseworthy emulation, placed at the disposal of their respective Ministers of Public Instruction the subsidies necessary for the classification, study and publication of the most insignificant documents hidden away in the most unimportant places. In consequence of this action—to refer to France

alone—we find that collections have appeared such as *Documents Inédits de l'Histoire de France*,<sup>1</sup> or the *Inventaire des Archives Départementales, communales and Hospitalières de la France*. The same impulse has given birth to the *Inventaire Général des Richesses d'Art de la France*; for art finds many a point of contact with the domain of history. A further beneficial result has been the importance acquired by *l'Ecole des Chartes* of Paris, etc.

These are things widely known, but what is less generally acknowledged, and what Catholics cannot too strongly insist upon, is the impetus given to historical research by His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. on that day when, brushing aside certain scruples, which, however worthy of respect in their time, are now deemed exaggerated, he threw wide open the doors to the Archives of the Vatican. We fear not to repeat here what so many before us have affirmed: that that day was the greatest in the annals of our century, as well for its consequences as for its having been so unexpected.

We pray the reader to weigh for a moment the value and meaning of these words, *The Archives of the Vatican!* At times the Popes have been the directors of peoples; again, they have been simply factors in the great international life; but in either case how many precious documents, as the result of their unique position, have found their way to the Eternal City! To give any just account of the value of this vast treasure-house, far exceeds the powers of any one man; it would be the life-task of many and very skillful specialists. Hence the writer makes no pretence of treating this question exhaustively within the limits of the present article, nor does he wish to pose as a Columbus for those who seek a world of things inedited; his aim is but to cast a glance, as it were, over this vast treasury, and point out how greatly indebted to Leo XIII. are those who are now ransacking it.

Assuredly, one would conceive a clearer idea of the character of the Vatican Library if, as has been said, he did but call to mind the rôle played in the history of the world by the Head of the Catholic Church; but how would its importance grow upon him if, passing simply to Rome, he were to run over the list of the principal publications that have been, so to speak, born in the Vatican, or read the list of the illustrious savants who, to consult its treasures, have not hesitated to travel great distances! After a Mabillon and a Montfauçon came a Mommsen, a Niebuhr, a Pitra, a de Rossi, a Pertz, a Sickel. There are to be found shelves filled simply with *catalogues* of manuscripts which the searcher would

---

<sup>1</sup> Herein are to be found the complete *Correspondance du Card. Richelieu*; the *Chroniques des Religieux de St. Denys*, etc.

have to run over. That alone of Confalonieri (1628-38), who drew up a list of the files of papers relating chiefly to political or territorial questions, which, in his time, were to be found in the Castle San Angelo, would furnish material for many days' reflection. But, better still, could one but command the keys of those venerable book-cases, and ransack their contents at leisure, on what precious relics could he lay his hand! Not to mention their artistic wealth, such as the "Breviary of Matthias Corvinus," illuminated by Attavante (fondo d'Urbino, No. 112); or the *Ceremonial* executed for Boniface IX. (f. lat., 3747); or the superb selection of the works of St. Augustine, made for the immortal Nicholas V. (lat., 501); or the "Bible with Glossary" of the Avignonese Clement VII. (lat., 45), he would find literary and critical treasures, such as the famous Greek codex of the Septuagint, called *Vaticanus*, 1209, or *Virgil, romanus*, 3867, or the famous palimpsest, through which, hidden by the Sermons of the Bishop of Hippo, Cardinal Mai discovered the "Republic" of Cicero. And again—for marvels crowd upon us—there is the Canzoniere (autograph) of Petrarch, the "Terence" of Bembo, and the useful and curious autograph works of St. Thomas, worthy of veneration indeed, but to all appearances undecipherable. Then, again (in quite a different style), and just beside the beautiful volume, "Defensio Fidei," signed by the hand of King Henry VIII. himself, is to be seen a little collection of the love-letters of this monarch to Anne Boleyn.

But not to delay over these and similar surprises, there are unnumbered documents to be studied; for example, those which, in cases of contest, establish the exact rights of the temporalities of the Holy See: thanks to these, Father Theiner has been enabled to publish three folios of diplomas concerning this important subject. There are also to be examined the Archives of the *Camera Apostolica*, and a large portion of those of the *Dataria*, the rest of which still remain at the Lateran; those, moreover, called of the *Guarda-Roba*; those of the *Cancellaria*; those of the *Secretariate of State*, containing the enormous correspondence with the various *Nunciatures*; numerous accounts of *Conclaves*, assemblies about which, and, at times, within which, diplomacy was, of old, wont to weave so many curious intrigues; hosts, also, of letters of Popes to monarchs and the most distinguished cardinals; correspondence of great personages and of famous heretics, Luther, for instance; the original *Liber Censuum*, that is, the register of the revenues of the Holy See; the diaries of the *Magistri Cærimoniarum* (the arbiters of etiquette), the most notable being the *Diarium of J. Burkhardt*, that close student of the life of Alexander VI., a journal less slanderous than unfriendly rumor had re-

ported it, but, at any rate, very interesting in establishing famous questions of precedence, the movements of ambassadors, etc. We might also cite the documents which make known the relations between certain Popes and artists; those which pertain to the *Missions* among the heathen; the preparatory labors of the Benedictines of St. Maur for their edition of the Councils of France; in short, a fund so immense that the *Varia politicorum*, a portion collected under Clement IX., occupies no less than twelve large chests! a fund from which Cardinal Mai has drawn matter for ninety large volumes of inedited texts relating to the two antiquities, as his old-time predecessor, Baronius, had found therein nearly all the literary and diplomatic information contained in his "Annals."

If figures are desired, the *fondo latino* of the Library, irrespective of the Archives, contains nearly eleven thousand manuscripts, and the collection of letters or papal petitions, thirteen thousand in folio! M. V. Forcella, in 1879, filled four large volumes with the Catalogue of the Vatican MSS. having relation to the history of Rome alone.

Even young America can find here rich gleanings for her history: and we would be happy to make this publicly known, had not everybody noticed, at the Chicago Exposition, in the building which reproduced the Franciscan Convent of La Rabida, at Palos, that collection of precious American documents of each of which, for that occasion, only two copies had been photographed from the original, at the printing office of the Vatican. What could be more suggestive than the very title of that work, which we give here entire:

*Documenta selecta e tabulario secreto Vaticano, quæ Romanorum Pontificum erga Americæ populos curam ac studia tum ante tum paullo post insulas à Christophero Columbo repertas testantur phototypia descripta. Typis Vaticanis 25 exemplaria ita sunt adornata, ut illustrioribus tantum bibliothecis distribuerentur, 1893.*

Then, on the first page, we read the Dedication:

Leoni XIII. Pont. Max.  
quod singulari animi benevolentia votis annuens  
administratorum Reip. Americæ  
Septentr.  
præclara quædam specimina Romanarum artium  
et recondita tabularii Vaticani monumenta  
phototypice expressa  
Chicagam transmisit an. MDCCCXCIII  
I. C. Heywood Americanus  
e cubiculariis S.S.D.N. ense et pallio distinctis  
cui ipsi republicæ moderatores  
huius rei procurande officium demandaverant  
tenue hoc grati animi donum  
libens merito offert.



This folio is in every way remarkable; see, moreover, how interesting the general import of the documents which it includes:

I.—De episcopatu Gardensi in Gronlandia.

II.—De finibus inter Hispaniæ et Lusitaniæ regna constituendis (in America).

III.—De præconibus Evangelii et episcopis transmittendis.

IV.—Commendatur Bartholomæus et Didacus Colon.

One would scarcely notice the expression *tum ante*, included in the title of the volumes; yet it shows that, long before Columbus trod American soil, Greenland had been discovered by Scandinavian sailors, most probably at the beginning of the eleventh century, then evangelized, under King Olav II.;<sup>1</sup> that a bishopric, that of Gardar, had been created at the beginning of the twelfth century: this is attested in the writing of Pope Innocent II. dated 1133. Now, this is but a specimen of the ten documents of this kind included in the first of the series above-mentioned; all, from year to year, inform us of the state of the Church in northern America antecedent to the arrival of Columbus. We can form some idea of the amount of information relative to every country which the Vatican Archives can furnish, since, regarding a country so distant, and an epoch so remote, it can present such important documents. Those that concern the line of demarcation of Alexander VI., 1493, are not less important, since by it was constituted the permanent political condition of those regions. They enable us, moreover, to reject the story that poetical fiction still teaches in schools, of a line energetically traced by the very hand of the Pope on a map that had been presented to him: a map the *original* of which several libraries boast of possessing, as truthfully as do those treasuries that claim they hold the sword of Roland.<sup>2</sup>

The fact is that this famous line was made only most prosaically, by three diplomatic documents, which form Nos. 11, 12, 13 of the volume in question. The third series, relating to the first missionaries, encloses a score of papers: here again the legend of the Franciscan Bernardo Monticastro da Todi, as first apostle of the West Indies, must be rejected, in favor of the Benedictine Bernard Boyl;<sup>3</sup> and the letter of Alexander, dated June 23d, 1493, confer-

<sup>1</sup> Cf., Ehrle, S. J., *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1894, iv., heft.

<sup>2</sup> The second map of America, that of Albert Cantino, drawn in 1502, that is to say, one year before the death of Alexander VI., is the first to bear this line.

<sup>3</sup> At that time a Minim. The order of Minims was as yet but little known; a circumstance which caused an error in the registration even of the paper in question. The Secretary wrote "of the Minorites" an error which Wadding in his *Annales Minorum* has not a little contributed to spread. See also the *Bullarium* of Fr. Hernæz, S. J., another work which shows what treasures can be drawn from the Vatican. It is entitled: *Coleccion de bulos, breves y otros documentos relativos a la Iglesia d'America y Filij'inas*, Bruselas, 1879, 2 vols., 4to.

ring on him his powers, opens the third series of our phototypes : those of the Franciscans come next and are quite numerous. On the 7th of June, 1526, Pope Clement VII. sent to the General of that Order a document (No. 22, p. 4), in which he urges him strongly to visit the new missions, doubtless because they had great need of it: No. 23 leaves, moreover, no doubt on this point.

The information contained in the above cited documents proves—and it is the point we are aiming at—how true is that saying of an indefatigable investigator: “The Keys of St. Peter are still, at this present time, the Key of the Middle Ages,” and how much meaning the very name of the Vatican Library conveys to the cultured mind.

Formerly, before the Reformation, at a time when the Church had to take less precaution against the malicious interpretation of certain documents, under Nicholas V., that true and liberal founder of the present library, access to these treasures, nay, the loan of them was very easy; for the books of the Holy Father might, for good reasons, be carried away by those who needed them. But, little by little, formalities came into being, difficulties increased, and only some few privileged ones among the literati were allowed to draw from these sources. What we have said applies especially to the last two centuries, for in the time of Montaigne, one could still, easily enough, find access, if not to all the archives, at least to the library of MSS. “Every one sees,” says the philosopher in his *Journal de Voyage* (1581), “and draws from it what he wishes; it is open almost every morning; and, under the guidance of a gentleman, I was taken everywhere and allowed to use whatever I wished.”

But, following the footsteps of his ancient predecessors of the Renaissance, Leo XIII. has decided to be no longer a miserly holder of the domain of Universal History, the Sphinx ever seated on her jewels to keep them out of sight. Assured, moreover, that, as a great man has said, “The Church needs only the truth”; equally persuaded that in our epoch, at once so severely critical and so humanely compassionate, it is not difficult to establish the desired distinction between certain personages and the eternal principles which they represented, particularly when they belonged to an institution so beneficent as is the Church, Leo XIII. has willed that his Archives be open *at all times* and *to everybody*. For him, no more *segreta* or *segretissima*, stern words, the restrictive import of which went on, day by day, increasing. In a word, and to speak a language that will be well understood by the practical people of the United States, he had there *capital* which should no longer remain unproductive. Now, see how, according to the very words of Leo XIII. at the beginning of his Pontificate, this is to be

extended. "We desire nothing," says his Holiness, "save to bring about a reformation which is due to the honor of the Church and which favors the progress of true science. We know how ardent in historical research are the men of our time, and how eagerly they strive to reach the hidden causes of events. Nor are we ignorant that the enemies of religion have abused these tendencies to obscure the light of history, giving credence to inventions the most false, calumniating the innocent, and casting hatred and obloquy on men worthy the admiration of all posterity.

"Now, utterly to destroy such falsities, nothing is more proper, nothing more efficacious, than to bring them face to face with the truth itself as revealed in the irrefragable testimony of texts and documents.<sup>1</sup> And as the Vatican is, in this respect, admirably provided, we have judged that if we wished to have knowledge and strength to discover the truth to all, to defend Catholic institutions and combat error, it was necessary to avail ourselves of resources of every kind."

And, in truth, was it not well to return openly to the traditions of Nicholas V., who had been so lavish of toil and money to found a rich historical centre "for common use," as was said "of the Roman Court and the savants of all lands?" This fact Card. Capecepolo, "Bibliotecario di S. R. C.," in an address to Leo XIII. at the time of his jubilee, declared to His Holiness, saying that the measures taken by him "recalled the glorious days of the illustrious pontiffs who, even in times the most troubled and warlike, had shone none the less brilliantly by their knowledge, and had thus rendered to the Church and to civil society most signal services."

Nothing will stop Leo XIII. in his vast design—neither certain representations, nor expense, nor the restriction of his palace. "It is certain, most Holy Father," said the same cardinal to him again last year, "that such researches will assuredly reveal in popes, bishops, and priests weaknesses and errors hitherto concealed. But you are profoundly convinced—and rightly so—that the truth of Christ has need neither of subterfuges nor lies, which would tend, indeed, but to obscure it. The Church, of which you are the infallible Head, shines with such a brilliancy of truth, of beauty, and of goodness, that the shadows of our imperfections cannot harm it. A grand and courageous love of truth, then, it seems to me, characterizes all that your Holiness has accomplished in favor of the Library and Archives of the Vatican. The beneficent measures which you have taken are not destined exclusively

<sup>1</sup> It is thus that writers have been able to refute the calumny of the torturing and of the frightful prison? (the Villa Medici) of the great Galileo (Grisar, S. J., *Galilei-studien*); and also certain exaggerations regarding Alexander VI.

for Rome and Italy; all who love study, historical science especially, may, without distinction even of creeds, avail themselves of its advantages."

And, in truth, we now see, elbowing one another in the Vatican, and day by day growing more numerous, the Catholic, the sectarian, and the rationalist. They live on the best terms in the world, not without profit mutual and multiplied for all. The Pope was not mistaken. He does, indeed, possess treasures, and M. Pastor, the celebrated professor of Innsbruck, has been able to say in the Preface to his "History of the Popes" that, "thanks to the generous opening of the Archives, due to the initiative taken by His Holiness Leo XIII., the History of the Popes of the Fifteenth Century, as well as of those that succeeded them, will necessarily have to be re-written." Another result has been the foundation of societies of literati, continually being established around the Vatican, for its amicable despoilment. Beside the *Ecole Française*, definitively constituted in 1875, which has obtained the favor of publishing the Register of Innocent IV., are to be found the Institutes of Austria and of Prussia, of the envoys of the Royal Academy of Bavaria, of the *Goerres-Gesellschaft*, of the Public Record Office, and others. Notice, again, the publication of a host of special works, all more or less based on the Vatican MSS. Mgr. Carini, the regretted Prefect, whose recent inopportune death Rome still laments, and who will remain, for many reasons, forever to be regretted (for the appointment of the erudite and not less obliging Father Ehrlé, S. J., is unfortunately only provisory), was able, without any pretence at research, to draw up a list of more than one hundred and fifty solid works whose production had been due, in some sort, to this initiative of the Holy Father; yet, in that list, through modesty, he has failed to note thirty learned pamphlets, the substance of which had been drawn from the compartments confided to his care, many of them, indeed, the product of his own pen. The staff of the Library have not, in this regard, been behindhand; they follow in the footsteps of Card. Pitra, of some of whose works we have already spoken. We may here also mention his "Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta" (1865-68), and those editions of the Greek hymn-writers whence he first deduced the laws of "Greek Hymnography"—works which won for him the office of cardinal-librarian.

Very Rev. Abbé Costa-Luzzi, the present vice-librarian, has continued, with discernment (an observation which applies to all the labors of this pontificate), the "Nova Bibliotheca Patrum" of Card. Mai, predecessor of Card. Pitra. He has also continued the phototypical edition of the *Codex Vaticanus Grec.* 1209 of the Bible," a little book which costs only one thousand francs! Again,

to him we are indebted for an edition of the same MS. with modern characters, issued by the Vatican press, and worth seven hundred francs; and he has introduced to the general public, by means of a perfect reproduction, that curious and important *Patmos Evangelistarium* marked 3785, *written in letters of gold and silver on a purple ground*, a striking testimony of the profound respect shown by our fathers for the Sacred Scripture. But, more than all, he has made easy an edition which should bring together in beautiful unity the fragments which are scattered at the present time in the Vatican, in London, and in Vienna. Let us here add, that to him we owe—to the ruin of his eyes—the palimpsest fragments of the Geography of Strabo.

Father Denifle, O. P. sub-archivist, who had already published "Die Päpstlichen Bände des XIII. Jahrhunderts," has just brought out, in collaboration with Mgr. Chatelain, the interesting *Cartulaire de l'Université de Paris*.

One of the *Scriptores*, O. Marucchi, famous pupil of the famous de Rossi, in 1888, catalogued and described a valuable collection of Egyptian papyri possessed by the Vatican Library, which catalogue he presented at the Oriental Congress of Stockholm, to which he had been sent by Leo XIII.

Mgr. M. Ugolini, the active president of the Leonine Library, exceedingly well versed in Oriental languages, has also made his mark in *Jacobi Edesseni de fide adversus Nestorium carmen ex Ms. Syriaco Vaticano 173 edidit et latinitate donavit M. V.*

M. M. G. Gibelli and G. Brunamonti, under-officers, have produced an interesting inedited report of the "Armament of the Papal troops under Clement XI." Nor must we forget the present eminent provisory prefect Father Ehrle, author of a large quarto, soon to be followed by a second, on the *Historia bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum, tum Bonifatianae, tum Avenionensis (Romae typis Vaticanis, 1890)*. Of writers outside the staff we notice, first, E. Müntz, author of "Art at the Papal Court in the XVth and XVIth Centuries; from unpublished documents drawn from Roman Libraries and Archives," one of the gems of the erudite collection made by the Ecole Francaise of Rome, so worthily inaugurated by the Abbé Duchesne's study of the *Liber Pontificalis*, the large edition of which, in two volumes quarto, at the price of two hundred francs, is already exhausted. Other pupils of this school are charged by the French Government to publish from the original Vatican MSS. the numerous *Regesta* of the Popes. Of these, several have already appeared, among which, if the reader's patience will allow him to read a list apparently dry, but, in reality, most interesting, we find, as illustrations of our subject, the Registers of Innocent IV. (1242–54), of Benedict XI.

(1303-4), of Boniface VIII. (1293-1303), of Nicholas IV (1288-92), of Gregory IX. (1227-41), of Clement IV. (1265-68), of Gregory X. and John XXI. (1271-77), of Urban IV. (1261-64), of Nicholas III. (1277-80), of Alexander IV. (1254-61), and of Martin IV. (1281-85), the complete series of Honorius IV. (1285-87). We are sure the above enumeration will not be thought wearisome by one who, in running over it, thinks of the great work being done in the hive which the Holy Father has opened. Father Palmieri, one of the archivists, is charged with explaining the difficulties met with on the way, in which, indeed, he leads by his guide-book, entitled "Ad Vaticani Archivi Romanor. P. P. Regesta Manuductio."

The sympathetic Paul Fabre, another pupil of the *Ecole Française*, edited, in 1892, with Introduction and Notes, the *Liber Censuum*; that famous book wherein is to be found inscribed, province by province, the names of the debtors of the Roman Church and the amount of their dues. Collaborating with Müntz, he gave us, also, in 1887, "*The Vatican Library in the Fifteenth Century . . . a Contribution to the History of Humanism*," wherein we meet (to show the curious as well as the instructive side of the Vatican), besides the catalogue of the library of the great Sixtus IV., the *loan-book* carefully kept by his librarian, the illustrious Platyna, immortalized in that well-known fresco of the Pinacothèque, where Melozzo de Forli has represented him receiving from the Pope the collation of his title. The venerable list begins thus: *Quisquis es qui tuum nomen hic inscribis, ob acceptos commodo libros e bibliotheca Pontificali, scito te indignationem ejus et execrationem incursum, nisi peropportune integros reddideris. Hoc tibi denuntiat Platyna, S. Suae Bibliothecarius, qui tantae rei curam suscepit pridie Kal. Mort. 1475, Pontif. sui an. III.* He did not fail, as was proper, to give the example himself by writing: "*Ego Platinus ad usum meum accepi ex biblioth. Platonem, de republica, ex membr., in rubeo, I. Mens, Apr. 1475.—RESTITUTUS.*" So frequent are these entries that one cannot but conceive a high idea of his intellectual activity; yet they are also proof most eloquent of the treasures he had directly under his hand.

M. Faucon gives us the "*Library of the Popes of Avignon . . . From the Registers of Accounts and Inventories of the Library of the Vatican.*" We cite this work the more willingly because it opens with an act of gratitude, and his words have so direct a bearing upon our two-fold object that we cannot fail to reproduce them; a son is never too profuse in praising his father.

"Among the different series of documents," says the author, "which the liberal organization given the Vatican archives by his holiness, Leo. XIII., in 1881, has permitted me to consult since that time, none more completely fixed my attention, none seemed

to me more calculated to satisfy seekers of precious sources of discovery, than the abundant collection of registers catalogued now under the head of *Archivio Avignonese*. . . . What curious and circumstantial accounts of the political conduct, general direction of Christendom, special government of the county Venaissin, relations of the sovereign pontiffs with their relations and domestics as well as with the heads of States! What elements of archæological information on the castles and churches built by their architects; the artists who decorated them; . . . on the reception of kings and ambassadors; . . . regarding religious or worldly ceremonies, of which they have been the theatre! . . . What a clear insight, certified by documents, into the literary taste, the degree of culture and polish; the mental and intellectual condition—in a word, of those popes and their surroundings" (p. viii).

This quotation is, in its way, a panorama of the archives, as well as a eulogy upon him who has thrown them open.

Is any one desirous of new and piquant information regarding those famous Greek savants established in Italy at the end of the fifteenth century, about whom old Audin, in his "Leo X.," has astounded our childhood? Let us take the work of Mr. H. Noiret: "Lettres Inédites de Michel Apostolis, publiées d'après le MSS. du Vatican," etc. Does he prefer the best edition of the MSS. of our dear Greek classics? There is *Le Manuscrit d'Isocrate, Urbinas CXI., de la Vaticane*, by A. Martin. Is he a mystic, desirous of a good text of the *Fioretti* of the seraphic Francis of Assisi? Mr. Amoni Leopoldo offers him his "Flores S. Francisci Assisi., Excerpti ex Cod. Vatic. 4354," with, it goes without saying, the famous Italian text; and so on and so on, for it is time to gain breath, that one may go farther.

For now, dear reader, we are going to tell you that the Holy Father himself has become an editor of his treasures. Every one knows that the Pope has at hand two printing offices second to none, not even the most celebrated in the world, in the correctness of their proofs, the beauty and variety of their types: those of the Vatican and the Propaganda. Now it is a well-known fact that the latter began, in 1882, the colossal edition *Opera omnia* of St. Thomas of Aquin; a work which will forever remain one of the chief titles of honor to the grand Pope whose solicitude embraces all things. He, himself, has willed, *motu proprio*, to have drawn from the Capponi Collection the Dantesque Commentary of Fra Giovanni de Serravalle: his historico-juridical Academy prints and puts into use, at the Pope's expense, in the *Studi e documenti di Storia e diritto* materials drawn from the Vatican. We have spoken above of some *Regesta*: the Holy Father has published those also of the great Leo X., Clement V., and Honorius III.

But it was not enough to open his treasures for the general profit; Leo XIII. has, moreover, increased them at every opportunity. To enrich, at the end of the nineteenth century, a library like that of the Vatican was not an easy matter; yet it has been done. Father Ehlé—having noticed in the Borghese Library a number of MSS. that had come from the collection of Avignon and had passed from the Aldobrandini to whom Clement VIII. belonged, to the Borghese family—informed His Holiness of the fact; and, in 1891, when they were to be sold, they were purchased by him; so that, now, three hundred and seventy-nine venerable wanderers simply find themselves *at home*! Home, likewise, has been brought a *Corpus juris canonici*, with the glossaries of Gregory IX., who, as we know, published the Decretals; these details give the volume the importance of a contemporary commentary; also, a very valuable, and perhaps unique collection of the most famous sermons of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; likewise, an excellent text of the Ecclesiastical History of Cassiodorus, of the twelfth century, with a "History of the Vandal persecution in Africa," by Victor Vitensis: many historical documents, such as the Process of Election of Celestine V. and of Boniface VIII.; an account of all the ecclesiastical provinces, a most careful compilation of the fourteenth century which, it is said, well deserves the honor of publication; also the Conclave of Pius VI. with authentic Commentaries from the hand of a Borghese, Cardinal Scipio. And in another class we may mention a good and beautiful text of Pliny's "Natural History"; from all of which one sees the variety and interest of the restored property.

It is hard to tell which is the greater act, so to enrich a library already remarkable, or to draw up and have printed for the use of students, a practical and complete catalogue of the treasures already existing. In any case, it is an advantage to other nations, to France particularly, whose printed catalogue of all important treasures is the most advanced; it is an advantage of which the Pope did not wish his learned visitors to be deprived any longer. There were catalogues, some written, some printed, already in existence, such as that of the "Assemani" (1756, Benedict XIV.), but the greater number were, like the latter, too prolix, too incomplete. And precisely because of the trouble so vast a plan required, it was thought better to revise, to modernize, to begin all anew. Hence, by order of Leo XIII., and under the general title of "Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ Codices manuscripti recensiti, jubente Leone XIII., P.M., editi," there have already appeared by the labors of the two Stevensons, the "Codd. MSS. Palatini græci" (1885), and the "Palat. latini" (1886), the latter revised by the



illustrious de Rossi, who found time and address for everything: he has even enriched it with a dissertation which serves as an historical introduction to all the catalogues of the Vatican; then, in 1888, H. Stevenson gave us the series of the "Codd. MSS. græci Regiæ Suecorum<sup>1</sup> et Pii II."

But to attain the intellectual end, a new organization was necessary; regulations, a large corps of laborers, more extensive apartments were required. The Holy Father did not hesitate because of the expense which the two latter heads necessitated, well convinced that the resources of the "Peter's pence" are given to the sovereign as much as to the Pope, and that the generosity of the faithful finds a legitimate outlet in the diffusion of every species of enlightenment. Nor has he thought it derogatory to their high dignity to limit the Sovereign Pontiffs to narrower quarters, as if he had decided—pardon the expression—that the Church and Science should henceforth have but one and the same dwelling! This may well be said, because the library occupies the very centre of the buildings: it is, as it were, the sovereign surrounded by a grand cortège of dependencies. And as the servant must not be above the master, two large apartments, hitherto reserved to the librarians, were purchased and transformed into a fine, well-lighted hall, just as in the time of Paul V., the Cardinal Librarian had been compelled to give up his private rooms for the foundation of the new *Archivio Romano*; and as, later, after the death of Baronius, the revenues of an abbey devoted to his use, passed, forever, into the funds of this institution. Leo XIII. has, then, but followed the steps of his most illustrious predecessors.

For the Archives, a vast hall has been opened along the Allée des Musées; and two years ago, under that immense, well-known and brilliant Sixtine Library, which visitors behold all adorned with the princely gifts of sovereigns and of nations, was created (in place of an Arsenal) that magnificent library of consultation called the Leonine, destined to be one of the most beautiful and practical creations of this century in the Vatican, regarding which we may apply, and with even better reason, one of the verses ad-

<sup>1</sup> Christina of Sweden who, guided by such men as Vossius, had obtained, in 1650, the collection of the learned Alex. Petau, which, to use the expression of Saumaise, was "the marrow of the Manuscripts of France," that had escaped the ravages of the religious wars. These treasures were bought by Alexander VIII.: The like eulogy might be passed on the collections thus successively incorporated in the Vatican, those of Aldus Manutius (three hundred and two beautiful MSS.), of the University of Heidelberg (1623), called now the *Palatine Library*. It was one of the richest in the world and, as Scaliger, "the literary jewel of Germany," says, it had been formed by the generosity of the Electors, the spoliation of Convents, and the munificence of individuals such as Ulrich Fugger. Again, the library of Duke Frederic de Montefeltro, of Urbino, 1631; that of the family *Altemps*, rich in the purest treasures of the Humanism of the sixteenth century. (See Paul Fabre, *Le Vatican* 3<sup>e</sup> Partie, 1895).

dressed to Nicholas V, under like circumstances. *Cernitur in celebri bibliotheca loco!* Imagine a hall nearly one hundred and eighty-four feet in length, having a surface of more than three thousand two hundred and seventy-nine feet exclusive of the recesses of windows and doors, which, because of the great thickness of the walls, a point as advantageous in summer as in winter, are quite considerable.

This hall, created by a complete remodeling of the old building, has a beautiful Venetian pavement, a ceiling adorned with paintings in the best Pompeian style on a white ground. It is divided into two equal parts, in one of which we find the Palatine printing-office; in the other the Library of Consultation. It is lighted its whole length, north and south, by many large and lofty windows, which are opposite each other; and in front of these we find as many openings in the partitions which separate the two parts. The open bookcases, from which one may, under surveillance, take or consult at will, reach to the central vault; they are of iron, painted white, edged with gold; in the centre of the room are large tables with catalogues on the ingenious Staderini system. At the eastern end is the imposing statue of the Angel of the Schools, a sumptuous jubilee gift from the Seminarians of Christendom; at the western we find, and in all justice, Ugolini's most artistic bust of Leo XIII. In a word, the architect, Count Fr. Vespignani, has succeeded in forming a most harmonious whole, neither too gay nor severe—indeed, most striking and uncommon.

Destined for general knowledge, as well as for housing the archives already printed, it was necessary that this part should have easy communication with the MSS. and the archives; for it must not be forgotten that the Vatican is, above all, an antiquarian or manuscript library. It should also contain all the great collections. The first requirement is very fully satisfied; let us speak now of the second.

The Vatican was already in possession of a fine stock of encyclopædias. Thanks to Rev. Fr. Ehrle, the whole of it, together with the books which occupy the part contiguous to the reference library, was carefully removed and, above all, methodically installed. This excellent father, so well informed in regard to all the grand libraries of Europe, understanding better than any one else the ardent desires of the Holy Father, did not hesitate to delay the publication of his second volume—meanwhile so impatiently looked for—that he might correspond as fully as possible to the confidence reposed in him. He was in need, however, of the greater part of the documentary collections printed in our time—that is to say, the best part of the matter.

The administration proposed to different governments an exchange with the productions of the Vatican, but they, far from

being willing to accept a return, esteemed it an honor and a duty to send immediately to Rome the best of the national publications, too happy thus to show their gratitude to the Holy See for the facilities granted to their *litterati* installed at Rome. Each gave its portion. France, one of the first, sent the collections we mentioned in the beginning of the article, to which were added the "Bibliothèque" and the "Mélanges" of the Ecole Française of Rome, the "Mémoires" and the "Comptes-Rendus" of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, the "Histories of the Crusades" and others. England sent, splendidly bound, the "Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland," the publications of the Palæographical Society and the "Calendar of State Papers"; America, also, is found near England; but, unfortunately, her light is still very feeble, and the little there is emanates partly from European sources. From Germany we have the magnificent work of K. Kretschmer, completed for the centenary of Columbus: "Die Entdeckung Amerika's in ihrer Bedeutung für die Geschichte des Weltbildes" (Berlin, 1892), with a wonderful Atlas containing a considerable number of maps, partly unknown or unpublished, from times preceding or accompanying the discovery. From page 16 we quote a few words in honor of the Vatican: "The author owes thanks especially to MM. the librarians of Italy, who have most amiably seconded his researches, and, above all, to Fr. Bollig, S.J., of the Vatican Library," etc. Kretschmer indicates, at pp. 113, 120, 220, 362, 425, what he here made use of. We have also by a Frenchman, A. Gourd, "Les Chartes Coloniales et les Constitutions des Etats-Unis de l'Amerique du Nord, Paris. Par ordre du gouvernement, Imprimerie Nationale, 1885"; by a Canadian, Abbé C. Tanguay, the "Diction. Généalog. des familles Canad. depuis la fondation de la Colonie jusqu'à nos jours," 1871. Also the "Annals of the National Museum of Mexico," sent by the Director; the first year, 1874, of the "Archivo do Districto Federal, revista de documentos para a historia da Cidade do Rio-Janeiro"; also the "Annual Report of the American Historical Association" (1891-95), published at Washington, with the "Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the Indian Tribes of the United States," by H. R. Schoolcraft, Philadelphia, 1851. That is about all.<sup>1</sup>

And now see what we are aiming at. There are some people as covetous of books as others are of gold! Yes, we like to dream that having read our modest article, some wealthy American, devoted to the Holy See, will lay at its feet all there is to be found

<sup>1</sup> [Our learned contributor here inserts a note requesting the translator to suggest a number of *Americana* which ought to figure in the Vatican Library, in order that our country should be adequately represented in this great collection. This task the translator refers to more experienced hands.—EDITOR.]

on that side of the ocean of valuable collections, whether in North or in South America, inclusive of that grand, active and noble country, the United States. The dream is so delightful that we pray our Lord it may be realized.

But to continue our search: the German will find here the vast "Monumenta Germaniæ historica"; the splendid Viennese publication, *Monumenta graphica mediæ ævi*, and the "Kaiserurkunde" of Berlin. Bohemia and Austria-Hungary are richly represented, and Bavaria is, we hear, preparing to send a grand collection. Here the eye is attracted by the large volumes of the "Eidgenössischen Abschiede" of Switzerland; there by twenty volumes of "Ancient Acts of the Courts of Spain"; "Les Coutumes de Belgique," royal gift of that country is not wanting, nor, it goes without saying, the beautiful Italian collection, the "Monumenta historiæ patriæ," the "Miscellanea di Storia Italiana," and others. Sweden has sent her collection, made with the greatest intelligence, thanks to the care of M. Annersted, Librarian of the University of Upsal. Let us not leave this hall without drawing the attention of our patient reader—companion of our bird-flight hither and thither—to the "Gallia Christiana," the "Italia Sacra," the "España Sacrada," the "Oriens Christianus," the "Africa Christiana"; then to Martène, Mabillon, Mai, Döllinger and countless others. Add to these a valuable section of the printed catalogues of all European libraries, in which are included those of France, Italy, the British Museum, the Bodleian, the "Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum," the *Inscriptiones Christianæ* (de Rossi), and here we may well add "tutti quanti," all this is the work of less than two years!

Allow us to thank the reader for his patience, but he now sees—and we hope it will be thought some reward for his patience—that the Holy Father's library is *no mean affair*. Rich in historical manuscripts, as we have shown, it is not less so in printed matter of the same class. There, of course, still remain many things to be desired, but with the blessing of God, we hope that this library, even now almost completely equipped in regard to beautiful parchments, will yet become in all respects the finest in the world.

In view of the evidence here adduced, which so eloquently speaks for itself, we have but to say a word, interpreting, we are sure, the thought of the reader; it is that Leo XIII., the Pontiff to whom Rome in particular and the world in general are indebted for such facilities for the study of history, will assuredly take—nay, has already taken—in history a place, a throne, brilliant and immortal.

REV. E. SOUTIF, C. S. C.

ROME, February 7, 1895.

## EDUCATION IN ANCIENT GREECE.

THE schools of ancient Hellas have especial claims to the attention of the student of education. So prominent is the place of the Greeks in the intellectual history of mankind, so brilliant are their achievements in literature, art and science that since the revival of letters they have never ceased to exercise an irresistible fascination over scholars and thinkers. Generation after generation has sat at the feet of the great Hellenic masters; generation after generation has taken them for its teachers and models, seeking to emulate the combination of profound thought and perfection of form which are at once the admiration and the despair of their imitators. How came the Greeks to attain, seemingly without effort, the excellence which distinguishes them as writers and thinkers? No doubt many causes conspired to bring about the wonderful result. But if it be true that the child is father to the man, then among the most important factors must have been the youthful training of the minds, which gave birth to these immortal works of Greek genius. Apart, therefore, from the fact that our own schools owe to the Greeks not only their name but many of their methods and much of their teaching, the subject of Greek education is one of profound interest. This is especially true in our days, when the school question is always with us. Surely, if the Greek schools achieved such brilliant results, it is well worth our while to inquire, what was their character, what their methods of instruction and their discipline?

Unfortunately, we must begin our study with a confession of ignorance. Our knowledge of the Greek schools, it is true, is much fuller than is our knowledge of the schools of ancient Egypt and Babylonia. Still what we know is only a fragment of what we should like to know. Had we only the programme of a single school, such as the private schools of to-day scatter by the hundred among their patrons, we should be able to answer many questions that must now remain unanswered. We have, indeed, in the works of the Greek philosophers their views on many educational questions, on what should be taught, what omitted, what should be taught first, what last, and a hundred other points. But no philosopher and no other writer gives us a picture of a Greek school at work, of the distribution of time, of its classes, if there were any, of the grading of the classes. Besides, it is a fact, perhaps not so very deplorable, that the theories of the philosophers found but scanty application in the schoolroom. It is by no means

safe to infer that, because Plato or Aristotle says that something ought to be introduced in the schools, therefore it really was adopted in practice. The sources of our information are to be found rather in stray remarks of historians, poets and orators, in the genre pictures with which Greek artists often adorned their vases, in the numerous inscriptions brought to light by modern archæologists, than in the pages of the Greek philosophers. From sources like these we cannot expect to reconstruct a full, satisfactory picture of Greek education; but we may put together an interesting if fragmentary mosaic.

Another caution by way of preface. Though Greece was a small country, far smaller than some of the larger states of the Union, it was a country of many states and varied customs. Athens and Thebes were only a few miles apart, and yet a Theban in Athens would be like a Bulgarian in Paris. As regards education, for instance, so far inferior were the Theban schools that Theban parents who looked to the interests of their children often sent them to Athens. Sparta stood in even sharper contrast to Athens than Thebes. Now, most of our knowledge concerning Greek schools is derived from Athenian sources and concerns the schools of Athens. To ascribe to other Greek States conditions that existed in Attica would in many cases lead us into error. When we speak of Greek education, therefore, we should bear in mind that what is usually meant is Athenian education, and that Athens was since the fifth century before Christ the intellectual leader of Hellas. The pictures of Greek schools derived from the sources at our command must, therefore, be greatly toned down, if we wish to have a correct conception of education outside of Attica. Again, we must not place all the non-Attic States on the same educational plane. Corinth and Argos, for instance, were far more advanced than Arcadia. These differences were greater, the earlier the period of which we speak. With the advance of time the commonwealths of Greece gradually became more and more assimilated, and with their political independence disappeared many of their characteristic differences. Under Roman rule, therefore, we may safely admit a growing uniformity in the schools, not only of Greece proper, but throughout the Hellenistic world. In making this statement we do not mean to question the great pre-eminence of Athens, Alexandria, Pergamos, Antioch and Rhodes as centres of learning in the post-Macedonian and Roman periods; but what in modern parlance is called primary education was then very generally and evenly diffused in every part of the Greek world. As education was not on the same level in the different Hellenic States, so it varied at different times in the same commonwealth. In Athens, for instance, the

change was so great that we can with certainty recognize at least two well marked periods. We can trace the gradual development of education and set forth some of the more important features in which the new education differed from the old.

The oldest teacher mentioned in Greek literature is the Centaur Chiron. He taught Achilles, the hero of Homer's "Iliad," not only the arts of war, but also manliness, honor and reverence for the gods. Singing, too, he taught him and the mastery of Apollo's lyre. So lasting was the fame of this mythical school-master, that even in the days of Pericles the Athenian boys learned by heart a collection of moral precepts that went by the name of Chiron's Proverbs.<sup>1</sup> Chiron, no doubt, is an imaginary character; but the myth of Chiron proves that in Homeric times no little stress was laid on the athletic and musical education of the young Hellenic nobles. In those early days the girls also enjoyed advantages that were denied them afterwards in most Grecian states. Nausicaa, the Phæacian princess, and her companions are represented in the *Odyssey* as skilled in singing, guitar playing and dancing. That these arts were taught at school Homer gives us no reason to assert. Nevertheless, the importance attached to the physical and mental training of the young Greek nobles in these early ages is a point of no little interest. It throws light on the prominence given to the musical and gymnastic education of the Greek boy in classical times. It explains how Greek education became the well-rounded symmetrical system that has been so often extolled by modern writers on pedagogics. Athletics and music were heirlooms inherited from the heroic times, not features introduced into Greek education by philosophers and theorists.

Homer, we have seen, knows nothing of Greek schools. When they sprang into existence, neither he nor any other writer tells us. If we knew when the Greeks received the alphabet and first learned to write, we might with confidence fix, at least approximately, the time when the first schools arose in Hellas. But, much as modern research has revealed regarding the early history of Greece, on this point it has left us many doubts. The oldest Greek inscription, so far found, was discovered hundreds of miles from the home of the writers. Far away, in Upper Egypt, at Abu Simbel, on one of the colossal statues of himself, erected by Rameses II., were discovered short inscriptions, scratched on the granite by Greek officers in the service of the Egyptian king Psammetichus. They tell us the names of the writers; and, in some cases, their birth-place and their official position in the Egyptian army. We

---

<sup>1</sup> Χείρωνος ὑποθήκαι.

note with interest that these bold adventurers were natives of Colophon, Teos, and Ialysus, cities in Asia Minor. The Asiatic Greeks, we know from other sources, had, in early times, outstripped their brethren in Europe in all that relates to commerce and culture. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that these daring sons of Ionia, though soldiers by profession, were masters of the art of writing. This art, consequently, was by no means an uncommon accomplishment among their countrymen. What confirms this inference, is the well-developed character of their writing, and their use of several letters not borrowed from the Phœnicians but invented by the Greeks. The art of writing, therefore, was by no means new in their day. Now, what was the date of the Pharaoh whom these men served? Though the question has not been answered so as to exclude all doubt, most scholars are inclined to place them under the first Psammetichus, *i.e.*, between 654 and 617 B.C. At this date, therefore, there must have been schools in the towns of Ionia. It is not improbable that schools had existed there for some time before. Larfeld, in his "*Griechische Epigraphik*," expresses the opinion that the alphabet may have been known to the Greeks much earlier. Still, if the Greeks received their alphabet from the Phœnicians, as seems most likely, we must be on our guard against exaggerating the antiquity of the art of writing in Greece. The oldest inscriptions in Phœnician characters do not antedate 900 B.C.; and we know, from the tablets found at Tell-el-Amarna, that in the time of Amen-hotep IV. (1500 B.C.), cuneiform writing was still used in many, if not in all, the cities of Phœnicia. So much is certain: writing-schools could hardly be very common in Greece before the foundation of Nankratis, under Psammetichus I., had thrown Egypt open to Greek commerce, and furnished the Greeks with a practical writing material, *viz.*, the papyrus.<sup>1</sup> The earliest Greek schools, therefore—this seems a probable conclusion,—were founded in the great Ionian colonies of Asia Minor, from six hundred and fifty to seven hundred and fifty years before our era.

History takes no notice of Greek schools until a century and a half later. Their first mention is associated with two deplorable catastrophes: In 496 B.C., Pausanias tells us,<sup>2</sup> the athlete Cleomedes, of Astypalæia, one of the Cyclades, killed his opponent at the Olympian Games. He was tried and convicted by the Hellenodikai. Cleomedes lost his reason, in consequence, and returned home. There, in a fit of madness, he rushed into a school

---

<sup>1</sup> Iwan Müller, *Die Griechischen Privat Alterthümer*, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> Pausan., vi., 9, 6.



one day, seized the pillars supporting the roof, and shook them with such violence that the roof collapsed and buried the children, sixty in number, under the ruins. About the same time, a few days before the battle of Lade, which imposed anew the yoke of the Persians on the revolted Ionians, the roof of a school in the town of Chios suddenly gave way. Out of one hundred and twenty children only one escaped.<sup>1</sup> At the beginning of the fifth century B.C., therefore, even places of so little importance as Astypalæia had schools, and what is more, numerous-attended schools.

History, we see, practically confirms the inferences suggested by the date of the first Greek inscriptions. At the time of the calamities of Astypalæia and Chios, schools must have been well-nigh generally diffused throughout the Greek colonies of Asia Minor and the Ægean. That they existed at this time in European Greece is equally certain. Aristotle, in his newly-found "History of the Constitution of Athens,"<sup>2</sup> informs us that Solon's laws (595 B.C.) were engraved on wooden pillars in the king-archon's house. It would have been useless to do this without a fairly-general diffusion of reading. From the orator Æschines,<sup>3</sup> moreover, we learn that Solon enacted a series of laws relating to the conduct of the Athenian schools.

A hundred years, therefore, after the date of our first Greek inscriptions, we find schools scattered throughout Asiatic and European Greece. What led to their rapid and general spread? Was it the result of coercion, in other words, of legal enactments? By no means. The state, in Greece, left education practically free. It compelled no father to send his boy to school; it established no schools of its own; it raised no money for their support; it left everything to private enterprise. This is true no less of Athens than of Arcadia. Nowhere, moreover, did the state meddle with the freedom of teaching. Whoever wished to establish a school, whether he was learned or ignorant, competent or incompetent, had the right to do so. It was only a question of getting people to entrust their children to him. This policy of non-interference with education was so settled a tradition in Athens that in one of Plato's dialogues<sup>4</sup> Socrates tells Alcibiades that his school studies would be of no service to him as a statesman, for he knew well that the public assembly and the orators never meddled with the writing, the music, and the athletics of the schools.<sup>5</sup> But,

<sup>1</sup> Herod., vi., 27.

<sup>2</sup> Arist., *Constitution of Athens*, ch. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *In Timarchum*, § 10, ff. There is some doubt, however, as to the genuineness of these laws.

<sup>4</sup> Plato, "Alcibiades," pp. 106 E., 107 A.

<sup>5</sup> We know of one departure from this rule: The decree of Archinos in the Archonships of Ekleides (405 B.C.) ordaining the use of the Ionian alphabet.

while the state did not interfere with the studies of the schools, it kept a watchful eye on their morals and their relations to public order. We have already referred to Solon's laws on this subject. Those preserved for us by the orator Æschines are the following :

1. No schools are to be open before sunrise, nor after sunset.
2. No adults, except the teacher, his son, his son-in-law, or grandson, shall enter the school-room under pain of death.
3. No adult shall be permitted by the gymnasiarch to be present at the school festivals (the Hermeia and the Museia); offenders to be punished as pæderasts.
4. *Choregoi*, that undertook the training of a boys' chorus for the play, must be more than forty years of age.
5. No slave was allowed to anoint boys in the palæstra or boys' athletic school, nor to exercise therein.

These rules, it will be seen, have the character of police regulations. While they suggest how great were the dangers to which a boy's purity was exposed in Athens, they also show the solicitude of the Athenian government to protect it.

The Greek state, however, was very far from indifferent on the question of the education of its youth. It is true the parents might send their sons to school or not, without any interference by the state. But the laws, in the clearest terms, impressed on the parents their duty to have them properly instructed. The parents who had neglected to have their children taught music<sup>1</sup> and gymnastics lost their right to be supported by their children in old age. Surely this was an impressive warning to the poorer citizens. We hear of another law, which punished with death the thief who robbed a school, if his stealings exceeded ten drachms (§1.76) in value. This stern law is, by some, supposed to have been enacted by Dracon. Its excessive severity soon caused its modification. In the days of Demosthenes, whoever robbed a school was compelled to restore double the value of his stealings. But no law can impress on us more profoundly the value laid on education by the Greeks than the punishment inflicted in the seventh century B.C. by the Mytilenians on their rebellious allies. It is related by Ælian<sup>2</sup> that the children of the rebels were forbidden to be taught the alphabet and music; for the greatest punishment, said the men of Mytilene, was to live uncultured and illiterate.

In the palmy days of Greece, therefore, there were neither state schools nor state-paid education. There was only one exception

<sup>1</sup> The Greek word music often included the arts of reading and writing, and Graser thinks that it is to be taken in this broad sense here.

<sup>2</sup> Ælian, *Nat. Hist.*, vii., 15.

to this rule. This exception was made in favor of the orphan children of the Athenians who had fallen for their country on the field of battle. The city felt bound in honor to provide for the support and education of the offspring of its dead heroes.<sup>1</sup> The example set by Athens led to similar provisions in other Greek communities. But this charitable care of those orphans who had a special claim on the state can hardly be classed as a deviation from the settled policy of letting popular education take care of itself. And this policy, as far as we know, prevailed until the times of Alexander the Great, and even somewhat later. Then, however, a change seems to have taken place in at least some parts of the Hellenic world. The first case of assistance given by the state to institutions of learning is found in Egypt, where the Greek Ptolemies may, in a sense, be said to have endowed the newly-founded Museum, for they paid some of the great scholars they attracted to Alexandria, liberal annuities. It is not certain, however, that these savants were expected to teach from the very beginning of, what we may call, the Alexandrian University. That the Museum subsequently became a teaching university cannot be doubted. In the third century B.C. we first meet with state-managed schools. In an inscription found some time ago, we learn that in the third century, B.C., there were free schools at Teos, a town not far from Smyrna. They were under the management of the state, for the public assembly chose the superintendents of schools (the *paidonomos* and *gymnasiarch*), and confirmed the appointment of teachers named by them. The money for the support of these schools, however, did not come from public taxation. They were supported from the interest of a capital of 34,000 drachms (\$6120), left by a public-spirited citizen, Polythrus, son of Onesimos, to provide for the education of all the free children of Teos, girls as well as boys. Similarly the city of Delphi, between 200 and 100 B.C., paid its school teachers from the income of 18,000 Alexander drachms, bearing 7 per cent. interest. The capital was a gift of King Attalus I. of Pergamos. The Delphians had sent an embassy to ask him to do something for their schools. To the Rhodians King Eumenes presented 280,000 medimni of corn (about 368,900 bushels), the proceeds of which served as an endowment of their educational institutions. If we may trust the testimony of Diodorus Siculus,<sup>2</sup> state support and state supervision of schools<sup>3</sup> was quite customary in the post-

<sup>1</sup> There were no orphan asylums in Athens, however. The children were brought up at state expense by their nearest relative, if they had any, or, in default of such, by other citizens.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus Siculus, ii., 13, as cited by I. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> δημοσία επιμέλεια καὶ δαπάνη.

Macedonian period throughout Greece. We should hardly be well advised, however, if, on the strength of this statement, we assumed that most Greek villages and towns at this time supported free schools. Comparatively large and important towns like Rhodes and Delphi, we have seen, felt the burden of maintaining schools so onerous that they applied to liberal princes, like Attalus and Eumenes, for assistance. Smaller communities must have found it insupportable. The inhabitants, therefore, sent their children abroad to receive their education, or they patronized the local schoolmaster if enterprise or misfortune led one to establish a school, or the children grew up unlettered and untaught.

If we inquire, "What led the state at so late a day to disregard ancient custom and take upon itself the support and supervision of the popular schools?" we are obliged to have recourse to conjecture. Perhaps the example of the Greek rulers of Egypt and Pergamos may have suggested the innovation. Perhaps the decline of prosperity, the partial decay of commerce, and the consequent diminution of individual wealth<sup>1</sup> which followed the loss of Greek independence, rendered the people unable or unwilling to pay for the schooling of their sons. Political dependence and the loss of active political rights, for the exercise of which at least some schooling was necessary, took away a powerful stimulus of education. Lastly, the introduction of new subjects in the schools, such as arithmetic, elementary mathematics, and other branches, looked upon as especially practical, made it more difficult to secure teachers, or rather made it impossible for every broken-down or superannuated hack to start and conduct a school. Instructors competent to teach the new learning must be attracted by stronger inducements than the haphazard and scanty earnings of the old-fashioned pedagogues. Towns that wished to secure the advantages of the new education and remain in the forefront of the educational swim, must guarantee a fixed salary to competent teachers and support town schools from public funds.

It is, therefore, an undoubted fact, that after the end of the fourth century B.C. there were Greek towns that maintained schools from public funds. There is no evidence that they took the further step of compelling their boys to attend school. Ussing<sup>2</sup> indeed, seem to take as authoritative the statement of Diodorus<sup>3</sup> that Charondas established compulsory education at Locri. But the best authorities justly regard the report as un-

<sup>1</sup> At Athens, between 309 B.C. and 200 B.C., the number of citizens rated as *hoplitai*, and therefore possessing at least 2000 drachms, sank from 9000 to 5000. Busolt, *Die griechischen Staats- und Rechts-Alterthümer*, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> Ussing, *Erziehung bei den Griechen und Römern*, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Diodorus Siculus, xii., 10.

founded. In no other part of Greece do we hear of any attempt to force parents to send their children to school.

Nevertheless, we are assured that reading and writing were almost universal accomplishments in the more advanced Hellenic States. For Athens, especially, this assertion is made with great confidence. Plutarch in his life of Aristides (ch. 7), declares that in that statesman's time few Athenians were ignorant of reading and writing. To us, who know how many unlettered persons we find in modern Europe and America in spite of every attempt to stimulate and enforce education, the story appears incredible. Yet it appears to be confirmed by a Greek proverb, which said of an utter ignoramus, that he knew neither swimming nor the A B C.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes, however, it is dangerous to draw inferences from popular sayings. When we learn that even at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war the majority of Athenian citizens were farmers and lived in the country,<sup>2</sup> it seems difficult to take Plutarch's statement literally. Possibly he means to speak only of Athenians dwelling in the city. Even so, it appears remarkable, that without public free schools and compulsory education, the body of the people should have mastered the arts of reading and writing. There is another side to the question, however. At Athens as in other Greek and Roman cities, the slaves constituted one-half of the population; the citizens, at least in the latter half of the fifth century, received pay for attending the public assemblies and for performing their duties as citizens; besides, even after the calamities of the Peloponnesian war three-quarters of the citizens of Athens were land owners and men of some means. In view of these facts, we understand more readily how the Athenians came to be able and willing to pay for the education of their sons. Without it, a citizen could hardly perform the duties incumbent upon him, and without it he was probably to forego wholly or in part the pay, that formed no small part of the poorer citizen's income. We are not justified therefore, in wholly rejecting Plutarch's testimony. At the same time we may allow for some exaggeration, and must not forget, that the statement does not cover the slave population, *i.e.*, one-half of the whole. It seems certain however, that in the commercial cities of Greece, Asiatic and European, reading was a common accomplishment, an accomplishment almost indispensable to the business man.

Strange to say, the people that made so much of education, had but little respect for the teacher. From the earliest period as far as we can follow the history of Greek schoolmasters, they were

<sup>1</sup> μήτε νῆϊδδ μήτε γράμματα ἐπιστᾶσαι.

<sup>2</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

objects of undisguised contempt. When a man had proved his incapacity in other professions, or when old age made him unfit to work, he was told to open a school. When a Greek was asked what had become of a person of no consequence, the proverbial answer was, "Dead or teaching the A B C." Lucian, in describing Hades, punishes tyrannical kings and satraps by turning them into beggars, fish-dealers, and schoolmasters. Dionysius the younger, King of Syracuse, who, driven from his throne, taught school at Corinth, is the type of a man who had fallen from the highest to the lowest station. In one of his bitterest invectives, Demosthenes casts up to Æschines, that in his younger days he was, not a bad teacher, but a teacher. Now and then this feeling of contempt found expression in act. Alcibiades, for instance, slapped a teacher in the face, when he found that he had no copy of Homer. Surely, had the teacher's profession been respected by the community, the young Hotspur would have checked his unwarranted ruffianism.

How is this contempt of the teacher to be explained? In the first place, too often men became teachers who had by failure proven their lack of competence in other directions. The profession, consequently, was judged, not by its intrinsic importance, but by the worthlessness of those who embraced it. In the next place, why should men be respected for doing what any one could do? Any one was allowed to teach, therefore, any one was able to teach. No preparation was needed; in fact no systematic preparation was possible, for there were no normal schools in ancient Greece. Why, then, should the old Hellene respect a teacher more than we respect a common laborer? Lastly, slavery fixed a stigma on all paid labor. No gentleman would work for hire. Yet teachers received pay for their work; they sold it; they were, to repeat the expression of Socrates, slave-dealers of their own souls. Was it not one of the strongest grounds of condemnation against the sophists, that they took pay? When these men therefore, many of whom like Gorgias and Protagoras, were certainly scholars of brilliant ability and unusual attainments, were despised as hirelings, is it wonderful that the poor drudge, who taught the elements for a mere pittance, should be the object of general contempt?

Still it is but fair to recall that there were men above this common prejudice. Plato, who himself taught without pay, speaks in glowing words of recognition of old Dionysius, who had taught him the elements. When Isocrates, accompanied his teacher to execution, he was not condemned but praised. So eloquent is the

---

<sup>1</sup> ἤτοι τίθεικεν ἢ διδάσκει γράμματα, Meineke, *Fragm. Comicorum*, p. 698.

letter of Philip of Macedon to the great Aristotle, on the birth of Alexander the Great, so pointed an expression of his appreciation of the worth of a good instructor, that we cannot forbear quoting it. "Know," wrote the king, "that a son has been born to me. I thank the Gods not so much that they have given him to me, as that they allowed him to be born in Aristotle's time." In general it may be said, that after the Macedonian era, the teacher's lot, though still by no means enviable, became somewhat more tolerable. The great philosophers and scientists that taught at Athens, Alexandria, Rhodes and Antioch, were paid and sometimes well paid, and yet were honored by the kings of the East as well as by the proud Roman nobleman.

This is the place to say, in a few words, the little that is known of the salaries of Greek elementary teachers. As we have already said, it was scanty enough. It was usually paid on the first of the month. How much was the pay per scholar in early times no ancient writer tells us. The inscription, to which we have already referred, tells us what was the annual stipend of the various teachers employed in the schools of Teos in the third century before our era. The endowment of Polythrus, 34,000 drachms, was placed at  $11\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. interest, and from the resultant income (3900 drachms) three grammatists (literary teachers from the A B C to the completion of the course) received, respectively, 500, 550 and 600 drachms (\$90, \$99, \$114). Two teachers of gymnastics received 500 drachms apiece, a music teacher 700 drachms (\$126), a master of fencing 300 drachms (\$54), and a teacher of archery 250 drachms (\$45). These figures speak for themselves. Still, things were not quite so bad as the figures make them appear. The value of money was far greater then than now, and the food and garments of the ancients were far simpler and less expensive than ours. But making all allowances, even the loudest reformers had little reason to declaim against the excessive salaries of pampered schoolmasters. In the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ, we may be sure, the schoolmaster was even less well paid. His income depended on the number of his scholars, and was therefore not only small, but uncertain. On the other hand, we may admit that in not a few cases even the miserable pittance teachers received was more than they earned. They were not only ignorant, but careless. What concerned them was not the progress of the boys, but the monthly stipend paid themselves. "The stipend, not the teacher, teaches the elements," says the comic poet Menander. What astonishes us is that men of this stamp produced results as good as they achieved; for the wonderful literary achievements of classic Greece were the work of their scholars.

The place in which the schoolmaster dispensed his wisdom was worthy of the man. We say "place," for he did not always teach in a house. We read of schoolmasters who taught at the cross-ways. Dionysius, the ex-tyrant of Syracuse, was seen at Corinth teaching his scholars in the public streets. In the country, master and pupils were seen dispensing and imbibing wisdom sitting on rocks. Diotimus taught the boys of Gargara in this way. A crowd of bystanders did not interfere with instruction.<sup>1</sup> This state of things, however, was more common in earlier than in later times, in the country than in the city. In Athens, no doubt, as the *pedotribe* (teacher of athletics) had a well-fitted *palaestra*, so the grammarist had a suitable school-room. The schoolmaster, in the recently-recovered Mimiambs of Herondas, had a school adorned with the statues of the Muses; yet it is likely that Herondas describes the school not of a city, like Athens, but of a small place, like Cos. When the school numbered sixty to one hundred and twenty children, instruction out of doors was impossible. Hence, even the earliest schools of which Greek history speaks—those of Chios and Astypalæia—were buildings reared on columns, though their construction must have been flimsy enough. That in some cases masters instructed their pupils in the open air need not surprise us. Only a few years ago the Jewish boys of Thessalonica might have been seen squatting cross-legged about their teacher in the streets. The mild climate of southern Europe and the habitual out-of-door life of its inhabitants makes the custom look quite natural.

Our acquaintance with the furnishings of a Greek school is derived partly from pictures on Greek vases, partly from the statements of Greek writers. The school interiors represented on the vases, especially on the famous Duris Vase, in the Berlin collection, are quite simple. As the painter's aim was not to illustrate Greek customs, but to decorate a piece of ornamental ceramics, he presents to us not the school as a whole, but certain scholastic groups that readily lent themselves to his purpose. Whether he introduces us into the grammarist's or citharist's school, or pictures the scenes of the *palaestra*, he outlines for us, at most, eight or ten figures, including the teacher. The latter is generally seated on a chair, with a rest for the back, the *cathedra* or *thronos*. When reciting to the grammarist, the boy stands; while taking his music lesson, he is seated on a stool. Now and then we come across a music-master, who stands in front of his scholar, apparently beating time. On the Duris cup the *thronos* stands on the floor; in later representations we find it on a platform. Of benches

---

<sup>1</sup> Ussing, *op. cit.*, p. 101.



or desks there is no sign in these pictures; not because there were none—for surely sixty or a hundred scholars could not be kept standing in the background—but because to represent them appeared unartistic. Indeed, Greek writers mention *bathra*, or rising benches, as a regular part of school furniture in early times. The chief elementary teacher on the Duris cup holds in his hands an unrolled scroll—Greek books were always rolls—on which he follows the scholar's recitation. In a second compartment of the same painting we behold another master—probably an assistant, for he sits on a stool—examining some writing on a wax tablet, which he holds in his left hand. In the right he holds a stylus or writing-pencil, ready to correct any error in the exercise of the lad who stands before him. Hung upon the wall are lyres, rolled-up manuscripts, flute-cases, a basket intended to hold manuscripts, crossed rulers and drinking-cups. Whether these paraphernalia belonged to the master or to the students, there are no means of determining. So much is certain, that the scarcity and the costliness of books forbade the equipment of every scholar with copies of all the books he was to use. Each lad, no doubt, had his writing materials in the literary school, his musical instruments in the citharist's. The ink—for the wax tablet and the stylus were not the only writing materials—was provided by the schoolmaster; for Demosthenes, in ridiculing his great opponent, Æschines, reminds him of the times when he helped his father, Atrometos, to rub ink for the schoolmaster, Elpidas.

Having glanced at the Greek school and its furnishings, it is time to become acquainted with the scholars. The first thing that would strike a modern visitor in old Athens or any Greek city up to the fourth century, B.C., would be the absence of all girl schools. The Ionian Greeks of the classic age, as is well known, had little respect for women.<sup>1</sup> They considered her as a necessary evil. They credited her with little intelligence, and thought her unfit for any responsibility outside of the home circle. Woman's place was at the fireside, her destiny to cook and spin and weave for her parents, her brothers and her husband. Only women of the lower classes were seen frequently in the streets; the gentlewoman's interests centered at home. There she must remain. She left the house only with the husband's permission, and accompanied by slaves. There in the part of the house allotted to the family she ruled over her younger children and her slaves. To fulfil these duties required little literary education, perhaps none at all. It

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Dorian States not only in Sparta, but in Æolia and Bœotia also, the women held a much higher position. The political importance of Queen Artemisia, of Halicarnassus, of Philotime, Queen Regent of Cyrene, and the literary achievements of the Lesbian Sappho and the Theban Corinna, are sufficient to prove this.

seems singular that the total neglect of female education by the ancient Greeks did not suggest to some of their admirers that after all there was but little idealism in their views on the bringing up of children. If the Greek spirit was completely saturated with the sentiment of beauty, and its complete development in man, why should its æsthetic instincts be paralyzed when there was question of the education of girls? This was controlled by the law of strict utilitarianism. What the girl needed for practical life she got. What reason is there to assume that considerations of a different nature controlled the boy's education?

For the girls of classic Greece, therefore, there were no schools. Whatever accomplishments they acquired before marriage they acquired from their mother. If they learned to read and write—and undoubtedly there were women in Athens and other Ionian cities who were not illiterate, their mothers had taught them. They were married young; brides of fifteen were quite common. By that time the girl was supposed to know how to spin, weave, sew, keep her own and her husband's garments in order, cook and to manage the details of domestic economy. No wonder the young housewife was often, we may say generally, ignorant of reading and writing.

While the Greek husband's attention was taken up with political affairs in the court and the public assembly, that is to say, during the flourishing period of Greek independence, he had little time and probably little inclination to fill the gaps in his wife's training. Very different was the position when free government was dead, and the commonwealth either became a subject state, or certainly ceased to pay its citizens for service as dikasts, or in the assembly. Then the husband's thoughts naturally turned toward home, and found in his family life the interest no longer afforded him by the *agora*. Then he felt that his wife must be not only a servant but a companion; then, too, we find that the Greek girl's mental training became an object of solicitude to her parents, and we meet with provisions for her instruction in reading, writing and literature. The Teian schools, already spoken of, were by a special clause in the endowment open to girls as well as to boys. In the second period of Greek education, female education assumes a wholly different aspect. The example of the Dorian States, the spread of learning among the women of Asiatic Ionia, and somewhat later the influence of Rome, where woman's position had always been far higher than at Athens, as well as the changed relations of the husband and wife in states now deprived of political life, combined to secure for girls the educational advantages so far reserved for their brothers. Among the characteristics, therefore, that mark the second period in the history of education in Greece, we may safely reckon its extension to the gentler sex.

But we must not anticipate. Let us return to the Athens of the fifth century, whose schools were intended for boys only. At that time, we learn from the comic writers, there were schools in every district (*χωμη*). When the generation that had reached manhood during the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.), were lads, Aristophanes tells us, they used to go to school in troops, clad only in a *chiton* (a blouse or shirt), even when it snowed and stormed. The boys varied in age probably from seven to fourteen years; these years remained the school years throughout the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman period also. There were writers on pedagogy that spoke in favor of at least preliminary instruction at an earlier age; among them great thinkers like Plato and Aristotle. But as a matter of practice the seventh year was the beginning of school life, as had been advocated even by old Hesiod.

Up to the Peloponnesian War, we have said, the boys went to school in troops clad simply in a blouse without shawl. Since they went in crowds together, it seems natural to infer that they went unaccompanied. If this inference be correct, there was certainly a decided change in Aristophanes' time. For from the latter part of the fifth century downward, boys, as a rule, went to school accompanied by a slave, who carried their school implements, and watched over their correct behavior; the pedagogue henceforth is an important figure in Greek education. We do not mean to say that before this time pedagogues were unknown; they occur in the tragedies of Sophocles. But probably in the simpler days of old, in spite of the early school hours, the custom of sending their boys to school under the eyes of a pedagogue had not become general among the Athenians; perhaps it was confined to a few of the wealthiest and noblest. We must remember that the tragedians dealt only with the kings and nobles of the heroic ages. At all events, from the time of Pericles the pedagogue seems to have accompanied the average Athenian lad as his shadow; such, at least, is the impression made on us by Greek art and literature. Notwithstanding the cheapness of slaves in antiquity, however, we are inclined to agree with Girard<sup>1</sup>, that while pedagogues were undoubtedly common at Athens, there were many citizens too poor to keep them for their children.

At seven, therefore, perhaps earlier, the lad, who had so far been under the care of his nurse, was put in charge of a pedagogue, and not until eighteen or twenty was he relieved from his supervision. Who were these pedagogues? What were their duties? Generally—nay, almost universally—they were slaves; sometimes men of considerable culture, often barbarians from Thrace or Asia Minor. Sometimes they were men selected on

<sup>1</sup> *Les Éducation Athénienne au 5ème et 4ème Siècle*, A. J. C., p. 114.

account of their special fitness for the work expected of them; not unfrequently they were coarse fellows, broken down by age or unfit for other work. To our amazement, even the great Pericles gave to his ward, Alcibiades, as pedagogue, a Thracian named Zopyrus, so broken down by age that he was the most useless of his master's slaves. When Pericles made so gross a blunder, we may well believe that the complaints of the Greek philosophers on this subject were not exaggerated. Too often parents, blind to the consequences, entrusted their children to worthless or tricky fellows, merely because that was the only use to which they could put them. Plato paints the pedagogues of Lysis and Menexenus as men unable to speak Greek correctly. On vase-paintings the pedagogue often appears in barbarian garb. Still, the duties of the pedagogue were of the utmost importance to the pupil's development. Though he rarely instructed the lad entrusted to his care in letters, he was expected to teach him good manners and to imbue him with correct moral feelings and principles. A good pedagogue taught his pupil to walk in the streets with downcast eyes and modest gait, not to sit cross-legged, to observe proper manners at table, to take sardines with one finger, fish, bread and meat with two, to hold his fish in the left, his meat in the right hand, forks being unknown, to fold or take up his shawl becomingly, to avoid the markets and crowded thoroughfares, to make way for his elders in the streets, to give up his seat to them in the theatre, to keep his right hand under his shawl (*himation*), to arrange his garments so as not to expose himself, not to interrupt his elders when speaking, to speak only when asked, and then briefly and respectfully. All the external proprieties, we see, were under his supervision, and hence he had great influence in furthering or checking the development of his ward in order, chastity and respect for age and authority. We need not point out how great a power for good or evil was the pedagogue. A gentle, refined and virtuous man—and there were gentle and refined men among Greek slaves—could implant in a youth not only elegance of manners, but a sound moral character. Greek comedy often represents the pedagogue as the confidant of his ward, and, sad to say, the pedagogues of comedy rarely use their influence in the cause of virtue. In most cases we find them to be shrewd, selfish rascals, pandering to the youth's passions in order to promote their own interests. Knowing, as we do, the great chasm which, even in the opinion of so enlightened a thinker as Plato, separated the slave from the freeman, we can readily conceive the difficulties surrounding the slave pedagogue. Humiliated without scruple by the adults of the family, he was yet to gain and maintain the respect of his ward. What means

had he to do so except the perennial weapons of the feeble—unscrupulous cunning and finesse? The slave pedagogue, it is clear, was not a desirable addition to the machinery of education. It was the curse of slavery, as of other evils, progressively to give birth to further evil, and to avenge the slave by enslaving the master. But even in the rare instances, when the pedagogue was a hired freeman, his influence was seldom for good.

Such were the men who shared with parents and teachers the task of shaping the youthful mind and heart of Greece. When the pedagogue had brought his ward to school, he remained in attendance until the time came to bring the lad home. That is the view held by prominent authorities and supported by the evidence of art. On the cup of Duris, for instance, and on several other vases, decorated with paintings dealing with school life, a bearded man appears, elderly, simply clad, bearing a staff, and in some cases, at least, lacking the graceful pose of the genuine Greek. He is seated at leisure behind student and teacher. These men are generally interpreted to be pedagogues waiting for their wards. On the other hand, we call to mind that Solon forbade not only slaves, but even freemen, to enter the school-room, except members of the schoolmaster's immediate family. It may be said, no doubt, that Solon's laws were not the laws of the Medes and Persians; and, truly, we know that as early as the end of the fifth century B.C., men entered not only the grammarist's and music master's school, but even the palæstra. If it be correct, that pedagogues became fashionable toward the same time, the presence of pedagogues in the school-room would be natural enough. After school they led their wards home again, carrying their school baggage. In fact, whatever the ward did and wherever he went, the pedagogue remained in attendance. How did this perpetual guide and monitor enforce his authority? Had he the right of beating the lad whom he attended? Ussing thinks so, and Grasberger, in some paragraphs, expresses the same view. But in his later volumes Grasberger is inclined to the opposite opinion, and Girard agrees with him. To us, as to them, it seems unlikely that fathers should so far forget their rooted prejudice as to permit slaves to birch their own free offspring. No one can doubt that at times human nature asserted itself in the slave, and that, under favorable circumstances, they did not spare the rod to spoil a particularly provoking and impudent spoilt child. The average pedagogue, we know from the comedians, was an abomination to the half-grown lad. He plagued the wretched slave almost beyond endurance, and if the pedagogue sometimes beat the young master, there are cases on record where the tables were turned. Slight, therefore, on the whole, must have been the unfortunate slave

pedagogue's authority, and slighter his means of enforcing it. His responsibility, withal, was undoubted, and he often suffered vicarious punishment for the naughtiness of his young *protégé*. Leonidas, the pedagogue of Alexander the Great, was blamed for some of the great conqueror's failings. Diogenes boxed a pedagogue's ear when he saw his ward eat meat without taking bread. Still, Diogenes was a philosopher, and at one time was a pedagogue himself. How much more exacting, severe and stern disappointed masters were, it is easy to conceive.

The pedagogue, therefore, has brought his lad to school. It is early morning, little after sunrise. The boy has just had time hastily to break his fast, for in ancient Greece, school hours began very early and lasted long. Solon's laws, we have seen forbade the schoolmaster to keep his school open before sunrise or after sunset. What were the scholar's occupations in the meanwhile? Greek education, the reader need not be told, did not restrict itself to the training of the mind; it looked not only after the boy's intellect; it also cared for his physical and moral training. Letters, that is to say reading and writing, he learned from the *grammatist*, gymnastics from the *pædotribe*; music, which was regarded the most effective means of forming the lad's moral character, the *citharist* taught him. Sometimes, it is likely enough, the *grammatist*, also, taught athletics; more frequently, he was also a music master. The association of scenes from the *grammatist's* and *citharist's* sphere of work on the Duris cup and similar works of art favor the suggestion, as also some passages in Greek writers. However our positive knowledge on this point is by no means full or satisfactory. Of course, the scholar did not follow the three courses simultaneously. The *citharist's* instruction began when the elementary teacher had prepared the pupil for it: for the *citharist* taught not only the playing of the lyre, but singing, without which music had no meaning for the early Greeks. Singing included the study of poetical rhythms, and the explanation of the hymns and other lyric pieces to be learned by the scholars. The musical course, therefore, was also an advanced literary course and was meant for riper scholars. Whether athletics or reading was first taken up, has long been a moot-point. Plato strongly urged that the physical training precede the mental. Scholars now, however, seem to agree, that as a rule gymnastics did not begin the boy's education; he went first to learn his alphabet, or perhaps went to *grammatist* and *pædotribe* at the same time. Though our authorities are far from clear on the question, it is probable that the morning hours were given to the literary master, the afternoon being assigned to the work of the *palæstra*. Still Ludius, the slave, in the *Bacchides* of Plautus reminds old Philoxe-

nus of the days when he went to the gymnasium before sunrise and after finishing his athletics to the schoolmaster. But Ludius seems to refer to the latter days of the old gentleman's school-life. We may not be too bold perhaps in conjecturing that the little boys went to school in the morning and then to the palæstra, while the more advanced followed the inverse order. In this way both sets of teachers would be constantly occupied. As to the division of time we have no information; indeed we are not even informed whether there existed any plan of hours.

The Greeks believed in the principle that to spare the rod is to spoil the child. "The man who has not been flogged," said a Greek proverb, "has no education."<sup>1</sup> In early childhood the young Greek was punished by his mother when he was naughty. The traditional instrument of torture was the slipper, and on more than one vase painting the artist has represented this feature of Greek education. With advancing years the mother resigned her position as flogger and the slipper was superseded. Greek lads, we should bear in mind, were often no less naughty than our modern scrapegraces; indeed, it is doubtful whether the young scamps of our nineteenth century have in this respect advanced far beyond their predecessors of old. Truant players appear to date back to the time of the first schoolmaster, and neither impudence, lying nor disobedience were invented by latter-day schoolboys. Lazy boys in Greek and Roman schools rubbed their eyes with olive oil till they had an appearance of inflammation and then claimed the teacher's indulgence for not knowing their lessons.<sup>2</sup> Other rascals drank cumine, which gave them an artificial pallor,<sup>3</sup> ascribed by them to hard study. In the recently-recovered *Mimiamb*s of Herondas we meet with the sketch of a young scamp who makes life miserable for his parents, and is, therefore, brought to school to be chastised by his teacher. The crimes of this young hopeful include, besides scandalous laziness and ignorance, destruction of his school utensils, truant playing, association with runaway slaves and low rascals, gambling, intimidation of his grandmother, lengthy absence from the paternal roof, the tiles of which he demolished for his amusement, and the wanton destruction of his garments. No wonder that the mother's slipper was inadequate to do justice to the villain. No wonder that she brought him by main force to his teacher, Lampriskos, to whom she relates all his wicked pranks. Lampriskos is no man of the slipper. He has quite an assortment of arguments, ranging from the simple birch to the formidable cowhide. He dis-

<sup>1</sup> Ὁ μὴ δαπτὶς ἀνδρῶνος οὐ παιδεύεται.

<sup>2</sup> Persius, *Sat.*, iii., 44.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Sat.*, i., 26.

regards the young scamp's prayers and prescribes an allopathic dose of cowhide.<sup>1</sup> This is administered by classmates after the culprit has been hoisted on the shoulders of one of them. As the Greeks wore no trousers, the preparatory ceremonies were much simpler than those necessary when similar chastisement was awarded by nineteenth century teachers some forty years ago. In general, we shall not wrong the Greek schoolmaster if we ascribe to him an abiding faith in the birch and a pronounced mastery in its use. On Greek vases the stick is almost as universally the *pædotribē's* symbol as the sceptre is the symbol of royalty. Of the music-teacher's method of enforcing discipline we read in the "Clouds" of Aristophanes<sup>2</sup> that :

"If any one with roulades fanciful  
Warbled and trilled such novel breakneck airs  
As Phrynīs taught, full many a cutting stripe  
Was laid on him for mocking thus the Muses,"

The poet, it is true, seems to hint in a general way that much to his regret and to the disadvantage of the generation then growing up essence of birch was not prescribed as bountifully as in his own school-days. In Menander's time (342-292 B. C.), however, the birch still flourished in the grammarist's school; for, in one of his plays as paraphrased in Plautus's *Bacchides*,<sup>3</sup> we read :

"When from the race-course<sup>4</sup> and the wrestling school  
You had returned with tunic lightly girdled  
And took your seat just at the master's side,  
If reading from a book a single word you missed,  
Your back was marked with stripes just like  
Your nurse's robe,"

At the same time there were not wanting men of discernment who raised their voices against wholesale flogging. In Terence's play of "The Brothers,"<sup>5</sup> which is a paraphrase of Menander's comedy of the same title, Micio, one of the brothers, expresses his conviction that :

"By wise appeals to self-respect, combined  
With kindness and confidence may lads  
Be better trained to virtue than by fear."

But old Micio was not the type of a large class. When philosophers like Antisthenes and Chrysippus, the Stoic, expressed their approval of education by the rod, we may rest assured that the

<sup>1</sup> Lampriskos had even worse treatment for young scamps. Chains and imprisonment were the portion of unusually wicked sinners. (Herondas, iii, 69.)

<sup>2</sup> Aristophanes, *Clouds*, l. 970 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Bacchides*, ll. 431 ff.

<sup>4</sup> A part of the *palaestra* or *gymnasium*.

<sup>5</sup> *Adelphæ*, ll. 67-8.



village schoolmaster had a firm belief in the same educational methods.

It is time now to enter the grammarist's school and watch the scholar's attempts to become acquainted with the Muses. As it was not usual to teach the children the letters at home, the master had the advantage and pleasure of implanting his lore in virgin soil. A-B-C books there were none; indeed, they would not have been needed at the outset if there had been any. We still meet with parents who feel that their hopefuls have half graduated when they can spin off the alphabet from A to Z, though they cannot distinguish one letter from another. These parents represent the oldest classical traditions, for the Greek schoolmaster began his instruction by teaching his scholars the names of the letters from Alpha to Omega. Having memorized the alphabet, the boys were now made acquainted with their written forms and with the phonetic value of these, which, in the case of the Greek alphabet, differs so greatly from the names of the letters. Then they proceeded to put letters together, *e.g.*, *beta alpha, ba, gamma alpha, ga*, etc. These exercises were followed by others involving syllables of three and more letters, *e.g.*, *gar, ger, gor*, etc., until the scholar had acquired a commendable readiness in what we may call syllabizing. He next learned to read whole words, and lastly sentences. Such is the account of the primary instruction we find in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who lived shortly before the Christian era. As we cannot well conceive a simpler and more primitive method of teaching a child how to read, it is safe to assume that the boys in the time of Augustus were taught in the same manner as the men of Marathon and Salamis. Indeed apart from some almost mechanical improvements, little was done to teach the elements in a more rational manner. The Greeks never thought of the phonetic method invented by Venzky (1721) and popularized by Stephani (1802), as some German scholars have asserted. Nor did they combine the teaching of reading and writing according to Graser's method (1765-1841). They helped along the memory to some extent by inventing metrical alphabets, which the scholars sang in chorus. Spelling, too, was done chorus-wise, as was the case in some modern schools till past the middle of the present century. We read also of a Letter Tragedy or Letter Spectacle (*γραμματικὴ θεωρία*) by the comic poet Callias (about 405 B.C.), in which the dramatic and rhythmic forms of the drama are used to teach the names of the letters, the combination of two and two into syllables, their division into vowels and consonants and other elementary facts respecting them.<sup>1</sup> Welcker

<sup>1</sup> Athenæus, *Deipnosophista*, x., 453. The best discussion of this interesting passage is Welcker's essay in *Rheinisches Museum*, i., p. 137.

is inclined to think that, though not written by a schoolmaster, the "Tragedy" was for school use, which would prove the existence of classes in schools (at least for Callias' time, *i.e.*, for the first period of Hellenic schools), as well as the striving after improvement in pedagogic methods. In later times Quintilian<sup>1</sup> approves of letters cut in ivory and given to children to familiarize them with the forms of the letters and to teach them spelling. We see how close the ancients came to Basedow's cracker alphabet, which was invented by that distinguished educator to feed German children both body and mind.

It is best, perhaps, to say here, that though during the first period of Hellenic education, we find no advance beyond the most primitive methods; at least some later schoolmasters were more progressive. Quintilian in the first century of our era, pointedly condemns the prevalent custom of teaching scholars the names of the letters without acquainting them with their forms. He also prescribes that after being studied in their regular order, the letters should be reversed or placed at random. Further than this, the classical schoolmaster did not advance in devising improved methods in teaching the elements of reading.

It is needless to say that with these crude methods of teaching, the lack of A-B-C books, charts and modern blackboards, the want of punctuation and accent marks, and the absence of space between word and word, more time was required by an Athenian lad to learn to spell and read than by the nineteenth century boy. The latter, moreover, has his road made easy and interesting by many other devices. Our modern A-B-C books are full of pictures, that not only interest the scholar but help his memory. Then the progressive principle is strictly carried out in the arrangement of the lessons, the earlier and easier always preparing the boy for the harder. Care is taken that from the start pure memory drudging should as much as possible be avoided, and interest be awakened in the subject-matter of the spelling or reading lessons, which must never pass the scholar's understanding. Step by step the child is led from the very gates of knowledge to its most mysterious mazes.

Not so the Greek lad. "When boys have learnt the letters," Plato tells us,<sup>2</sup> "and are able to understand written language as they understood spoken language before, the teacher gives them the poems of great bards and makes them learn the same by heart. For in these are found much instruction and many stories about the good men of old as well as their praises and eulogies, so that the lad may be eager to imitate them and strive to become like

<sup>1</sup> Quintilian, *Institutiones Oratoriae*, i, 1, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Plato, *Protagoras*, p. 3251, E.

them." No sooner, therefore, had the lad mastered the simplest mysteries of spelling and reading, than without any effort to lead him up step by step, the great works of Greek poetic genius were put into his hands. The object of studying these poems, according to Plato, was to hold up to the children the great heroes of Greece for imitation. No doubt the study of Homer and Hesiod, did excite lofty ideals in the lads. Their use in Greek schoolhouses, it is likely enough, was originally due to the absence of other reading books. The good results produced, the universal popularity of Homer and the conservatism of the people, transmitted these text-books from generation to generation. Homer, indeed, held his place in the schools from their very rise to the downfall of the Roman Empire. To the Greeks, Homer's poems were reading lesson, literature, history, psychology, and a catechism of his religious, moral and political principles. Listen to what the Roman, Horace, says of his merits as a teacher of ethical and political wisdom :

" While Lollius, you declaim the bard of Troy  
At Rome, I read him and enjoy  
Here at Praeneste; well, the sage of old  
More clearly and correctly far, I hold,  
Than Crantor and Chrysippus tells us, what  
Is good, what's evil, useful and what not."<sup>1</sup>

No doubt there were philosophers—Plato was one of them—who regarded the moral obliquities of Homer's gods as means little suited to inspire Greek youth with lofty ideas of correct conduct. But even the great name of Plato had little weight here—another proof how slightly philosophic theory influenced the development of Greek education. At the same time, it is but just to remark that the consensus of modern pedagogues pronounces Homer's songs admirably fitted to bring out a lad's manly qualities. Only, in accordance with the characteristics of the nineteenth century, the warrior heroes of the " Iliad " must yield the precedence to the adventurous Ulysses, the hero who saw many cities and knew the customs of many men.

While Homer was the chief, he was not the only author read by the boys of ancient Greece. During the period, of which we are now speaking, *i.e.*, before 400 B.C., they also memorized and read, probably in selections, the poems of Phokylides, Theognis, Solon, Hesiod and Simonides. More popular than all these were the *ὑποθίχαι* mistakenly ascribed to Hesiod, a collection of home-spun proverbs embodying the wisdom of the masses. It was supposed to have been made by the Centaur Chiron for Achilles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Horace, Ep. i., 2, 1-4.

The verses of the poets named above, also, were chiefly didactic, and abounded in striking sentences, setting forth familiar truths. The reader will appreciate a few specimens.

"Work for the young, counsels for middle age,  
The old may best in vows or prayers engage."  
—*Hesiod* (about 8–900 B.C.) *Maxims of Chiron*.

"Only a fool will fruits in hand forego  
That he the charm of doubtful chase may know."—*Ibid.*

"The fool first suffers, and is after wise."—*Works and Days*.

"Hard work will best uncertain fortune mend."—*Ibid.*

"Little to little added, if oft done,  
In small time makes a good possession."—*Ibid.*

"When on your home falls unforeseen distress,  
Half-clothed come neighbors; kinsmen wait to dress."—*Ibid.*<sup>1</sup>

"No mean or coward heart will I commend  
In an old comrade or a party friend;  
Nor with ungenerous hasty zeal decry  
A noble minded gallant enemy."  
*Theognis* (about 570–480 B.C.)—*Fragments*.<sup>2</sup>

"Fame is a jest; favor is bought and sold;  
No power on earth is like the power of gold."—*Ibid.*

"Of all good things in human life,  
Nothing can equal goodness in a wife."—*Ibid.*

"Woe's me for joyful youth and joyless eld  
This coming I behold; that going I've beheld."—*Ibid.*

"Of those at famed Thermopylæ who lie,  
Glorious the fortune, bright the destiny.  
Their tomb an altar is, their noble name  
A fond remembrance of ancestral fame.  
Their death a song of triumph; neither rust  
Nor time that turns all mortal things to dust,  
Shall dim the splendor of that holy shrine  
Where Greece forever sees her native virtues shine."  
—Simonides of Ceos in Lord Neaves's *Greek Anthology*, p. 2.

"Go, tell the Spartans, thou that passest by,  
That here obedient to her laws we lie."  
—Simonides's Epigram on the 300 Spartans who died at Thermopylæ,  
*ibid.*, p. 24.

We need not point out that such poetry was the best substitute early Greek literature supplied for a catechism of simple morality. Lucian, as well as Plato, tells us that the aim of the Greek schools was, above all, to implant in the boy's mind lofty ideals of virtue and goodness. We have seen what protection the law threw around his purity; we shall see, hereafter, that by sage and Philistine music was chiefly valued as a stay of morals.

<sup>1</sup> The translations are taken from Davies' *Hesiod and Theognis*, pp. 59, ff.

<sup>2</sup> Translated by Hookham Frere.

Homer, therefore, and the ancient elegiac poets, were the principal text-books of the Greek school-boy. Of course, we must not imagine that each lad had a full equipment of school-books. Paper was too dear, and the printer's art unknown. The teacher, as a rule, dictated the text, which was afterwards read as a class exercise. Often, too, the text was repeated so often that the scholar knew it by heart. It was not uncommon in Athens to meet not only boys but men who knew Homer by heart from beginning to end; indeed, the Greeks were proud of their quick and retentive memories. In Homer's verse and the saws of Hesiod and the other didactic poets, memorized by him as a boy, the Greek carried with him through life a library of literary and moral classics.

In training his scholars to read these poems, the master laid stress, above all, on distinctness of enunciation. To achieve this result, besides the usual means of making the student repeat the words slowly and often, syllable by syllable, the teacher made use of certain alliterative combinations of words, difficult to pronounce and called *χαλινοί*<sup>1</sup> (*i.e.*, reins). "Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers" is a sample in English of what the Greeks meant by this term. An anecdote from the life of Demosthenes shows that to attain clearness of pronunciation the Greeks resorted to other means also. Demosthenes, we read, in order to perfect his utterance, said to have been quite faulty at first, put small pebbles in his mouth while declaiming on the seashore. How this was to cure him of his defects is not very plain. Another point to which Greek schoolmasters directed the attention of their pupils was correct accentuation, a result not so easily attained in a language abounding in words differing in length, any one of whose last three syllables might bear the accent. Accent marks, it will be recalled, did not come into use till the third century B.C.<sup>2</sup> Above all, we must not forget that the poets read by the scholars abounded in uncurrent words, partly obsolete, partly belonging to other dialects. Another difficulty to be surmounted was the absence of punctuation marks. Accordingly, it required no little quickness and intelligence to catch rapidly the relation of the several clauses in a sentence, and give the required changes in the voice. On all these points the *grammatistes* of our first period must have insisted, for the *grammatikos* and the rhetoricians, the teachers of advanced scholars in post-Macedonian times, were still unknown. The *grammatistes*, no doubt, also instructed the older boys in rhythmic reading and the elements of prosody, at least as

<sup>1</sup> Quintilian, i., 1, 37.

<sup>2</sup> Aristophanes of Byzantium, chief librarian of Ptolemy Evergetes, was their inventor (240 B.C.).

far as the dactylic hexameter and pentameter are concerned. Without such knowledge no boy could have read effectively the sonorous verses of the immortal bard of Troy.

The aim of the Greek schoolmaster in his reading lessons was to make his scholars understand fully the meaning and the beauties of the poetical masterpieces of the nation. For the full understanding of these compositions, however, much was required besides the distinct musical and metrical recitation of their verses. Many of the poets read in Athenian schools did not write in the Attic dialect. The Homeric poems, the chief text-book of all Greece, are written in a language strange to every Greek boy because of its numerous obsolete words and forms. The greatest of the Greek lyric poets sang in the Æolic and Doric forms of the Greek tongue. To enable the lads to grasp the meaning of these bards, it was the teacher's constant duty to explain these ancient and dialectic words and word-forms. A strikingly difficult task, for we are speaking of times when the science of grammar had hardly been born. Only in the time of the Sophists did the greatest Greek thinkers learn the difference between a noun and a verb. To distinguish all the parts of speech was an achievement reserved for the Stoic philosophers. Besides these linguistic elucidations, the teacher gave any explanations needed to clear up the author's meaning. In doing so he taught mythology, ethics, history, astronomy, geography; in fact, was supposed to be a walking encyclopædia. The reading lesson included all the accessory branches, that is, so far as these branches were touched upon in the reading matter. Such was the good Greek schoolmaster's conception of what is included in a reading lesson in later days, when the *grammatikos* had taken charge of the more advanced lads. In earlier days the grammarist must have imparted this instruction, even if his work was less thorough. If to this we add the teaching of composition, we shall have a fairly complete picture of the Greek master's activity in the matter of "language lessons."

Writing, we have already said, was not begun at the same time as reading, as is the case nowadays. When the boy had made some progress in spelling, the teacher initiated him into the mysteries of writing. The Greeks seem to have taken pleasure in making writing as difficult as possible. They wrote with their tablets or papyrus resting on their lap, not on a desk or table. It is needless to comment on the unhealthiness and constraint of this position. The Greek lad, in this respect, was certainly at a great disadvantage compared with his nineteenth century compeer. While learning to write the letters, the boys used wax tablets, as we often use the slate. The master wrote the letters on an upper

line, the scholar on the lines below; sometimes he guided the boy's hand. In later times we learn of other expedients to aid the young penman. Quintilian (42-120 A.D.) speaks of boards into which the forms of the letters had been cut; the boy at first followed the lines so traced for him, and after some practice wrote independently. The great Ostrogoth King Theodoric wrote his name through a stencil plate. The mastery of the single letters having been acquired, combinations were attempted, for we must not forget that, at all events, in post-Macedonian times, the Greeks also used a kind of running hand.

In setting copies, the master strove to find words combining all the letters of the alphabet; words like *μάρπτε, σφίγξ, κλώψ* were favorites. Then followed lines such as are still found in our copy books, embodying moral precepts or other forms of practical wisdom. On a wax tablet, now in the British Museum, are found the following lines written three times in succession, evidently as an exercise in writing:

Take this advice given by a man of sense,  
Not ev'ry friend is worth thy confidence.<sup>1</sup>

Some tablets in the collection of the New York Historical Society contain similar copies made from Menander. The Leyden Library has recently been presented with a wax copy-book, consisting of seven tablets found at Palmyra, which had been a Greek boy's writing material; they contained, besides verses from Hesiod, a number of the fables of Babrius. The exercises are full of errors, additions and omissions.<sup>2</sup> In the early period of Greek schools, the scholar was hardly expected to attain great perfection in calligraphy. Indeed, Plato<sup>3</sup> tells us pointedly that boys should not aim at fine or fast writing unless possessed of special talent. Quintilian expresses very different views, and enforces them by very sensible reasons.<sup>4</sup> But Quintilian, of course, is the representative of a later age.

For the beginner, we have seen, the wax tablet and *graphis* were the writing implements. The *graphis* (Lat. *stilus*), was a metal or bone pencil, with a sharp point. When the scholar had attained reasonable skill in writing, he exchanged the tablet for parchment on which he wrote with a reed pen (*calamus*).<sup>5</sup> For work of especial elegance papyrus was used. The advanced scholar was also provided with a ruler (*κανών*) and a disk of lead, which was

<sup>1</sup> σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρός; προσηύχον συμβόλιον μὴ πᾶσιν εἰς τοὺς φίλοις πιστεύεται.

<sup>2</sup> Hesselung in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxiii., p. 293.

<sup>3</sup> Plato, *De Legg*, vii., p. 810, A.

<sup>4</sup> Quintilian, *De Instit Oratoria*, i., 1, 28.

<sup>5</sup> The first mention of quills is found in "Isidore of Seville," vi., 14, 3. (Blass, *Palaeographie*), p. 342.

the substitute for our lead pencils. These were used for drawing lines.

Arithmetic, in our sense of the word, was, by the Greeks, called *logistiké*: the word arithmetic with them applied not so much to practical ciphering as to the science of the relations and properties of numbers.<sup>1</sup> The earliest traces of computation among the Greeks we find in Homer. The term he uses for reckoning, *πεμπάζειν*,<sup>2</sup> points to its nature, *i.e.*, computing on the five fingers. This method of reckoning the ancient Greeks and Romans carried to great perfection. By attaching different values to the several joints of the fingers of both hands, they could express numbers up to 10,000. How general finger computation was among the classic nations we may infer from its giving rise to games, one of which, the Italian *mora* game, is very popular to this day. For lengthier and more difficult calculations the *abacus* or reckoning board was used. The Greeks borrowed this device from the Eastern nations, and used it throughout their history. Of the precise arrangement of the Greek *abacus* we have no certain knowledge. It is likely enough that it did not differ greatly from the Roman reckoning board. Suffice it to say here that to arrive at the desired results, pegs, pebbles or marbles were moved, sometimes in grooves, sometimes between lines, along different columns, signifying different values. Prior to the time of the Peisistratids the Greeks, when writing numbers, made use of the initials of the numbers to be recorded, *e.g.*, *Π* stood for *πέντε* = 5; *Δ* for *δέξα* = 10. About 470 B.C., the Greeks adopted a new method of writing numbers. From the Phœnicians they borrowed the practice of using the letters of the A, B, C, in their order as signs of numbers *α, β, γ*, etc., denoting 1, 2, 3, etc. To show that a letter was used as a number, a bar was placed horizontally above it. An acute accent indicated that a number was used as a fraction, thus  $\gamma' = \frac{1}{3}$ . This method of numeration the Greeks retained till the introduction of the Arabic numerals, about 1000 A.D. As a rule the units were placed to the right of the tens, the tens to the right of the hundreds, etc. On inscriptions, however, numbers of two digits are sometimes found with the digits in the inverse order.<sup>3</sup> Even after the introduction of the new numerals, finger computation and the reckoning board remained the chief means for doing problems in addition, subtraction and multiplication. Ciphering on paper, Günther<sup>4</sup> tells us, made little progress till after the death

<sup>1</sup> The term arithmetic as used to designate a part of the mediæval *quadrivium* had the same meaning.

<sup>2</sup> Homer, *Odys.*, iv., 412.

<sup>3</sup> Friedlein, *Die Zahlzeichen und das Elementare Rechnen bei den Griechen and Römern*, p. 10. Friedlein is the chief authority on this subject.

<sup>4</sup> Günther, *Geschichte der Mathematik im Alterthum*, pp. 236-7.



of Alexander the Great. While our knowledge of the methods used by the Greeks in reckoning is very imperfect, the following facts seem to be satisfactorily established :

1. The placing of digits of the same denomination under each other when numbers were to be added or subtracted, was a relatively late practice. It seems to have been suggested by the needs of multiplication.

2. For adding and subtracting the reckoning board was used, the sum or difference being written down at the end of the operation only.

3. The answer was placed above, not below, the numbers to be added, and was,<sup>1</sup> therefore, called *ξεφάλαινον*.

A simple example in multiplication will be the shortest way of making the reader acquainted with the Greek method of multiplication. It is transcribed from Friedlein.

$\overline{\sigma \xi \epsilon}$	265
$\overline{\sigma \xi \epsilon}$	265
$\overline{\delta \alpha}$	
$\overline{M M \beta \alpha}$	40,000, 12,000, 1,000.
$\overline{M \beta \gamma \chi \tau}$	12,000, 3,600, 300.
$\overline{\alpha \tau \chi \epsilon}$	1,000, 300, 25.
$\overline{\zeta}$	
$\overline{M \sigma \chi \epsilon}$	70,225.

A glance at the operations teaches us, that the Greeks, instead of beginning to multiply with the lowest denomination and ascending, as we do, followed the contrary order. Division to the early Greeks was only a species of subtraction, the divisor being subtracted from the dividend till the divisor exceeded the remainder. Later on, the accountant guessed at the quotient ; and if, on multiplying it by the divisor, the product was too small, the operation was repeated, till the remainder was smaller than the divisor. The Greeks, however, never had the idea expressed by our word quotient.<sup>2</sup> What we call quotient, they regarded as the denominator of a fraction, the numerator being one. Like the Egyptians, they sought to reduce all fractions to fractions with the numerator one, or, to the sum of a series of such fractions. The fraction  $\frac{2}{3}$  was an exception to this rule. The Babylonians transmitted to the Greeks their duodecimal and sexagesimal system ; the latter being extensively used in high mathematical problems with large numbers.

Such, in brief outline, was the method of reckoning used by

<sup>1</sup> Friedlein, pp. 74-5.

<sup>2</sup> Friedlein, *Ibid.*, p. 79.

the Greeks. Was it taught in their schools? Grasberger, followed by Girard, maintains that this was the case, even before the Peloponnesian war (430 B.C.). He cannot understand how a commercial city, like Athens, could fail to make this useful accomplishment a part of every boy's education. The argument seems convincing. Still, no Greek author and no inscription confirms it. On the contrary, Aristotle<sup>1</sup> tells us that the usual branches of instruction, in his day, were letters, gymnastics, music, and sometimes drawing. Some modern writers suggest, that ciphering is included in *γράμματα* (letters). It is true that letters were also figures. But, ciphering on paper certainly belongs to a relatively late period; it was not till the Alexandrine period, as we have seen, that it became common.<sup>2</sup> Besides, the very fact that Socrates, according to Xenophon,<sup>3</sup> insisted that simple arithmetic should be learnt, seems to suggest that there was need of such insistence. Moreover, we must not measure the fifth century before Christ by our own times. No doubt, finger computation was common, and transmitted from generation to generation, as our children, for instance, learn much simple arithmetic by playing dominos or *loto*. For the petty tradesman, no doubt, this method of reckoning sufficed. In larger establishments, of course, the abacus was used. But, as up to quite recent times, book-keeping was an art learnt in the counting-house, not in the schools, and as, even to-day, abbreviated methods of computation are learned there, so, there is no absurdity in supposing that reckoning by means of the abacus and higher commercial arithmetic in general, including the computation of interest, were learned in the Greek counting-houses. To us, therefore, it seems likely that Aristotle literally meant what he said, *i.e.*, that arithmetic was not taught in schools in his time (384–322 B.C.). In short, during the first period of Greek education, we may assume, without great fear of error, that, except perhaps incidentally, arithmetic was no part of the general course of instruction.

Music, during the first of the two periods into which we have divided the history of education in Greece, was regarded as a most important branch of youthful training. By its means, the Greek philosophers tell us, the Greek lad was taught morality, piety, and patriotism. Why music should be so highly valued, may puzzle us moderns. We associate it with amusement and frivolity. Not so, the Greeks. Their wisest philosophers, as well as that embodiment of common sense, the plain citizen, were convinced of its supreme usefulness. To the sages, the harmonious

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.*, viii., 2, p. 259, göttl.

<sup>2</sup> Günther, *ibid.*, pp. 236–37.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, *Memor.*, iv., 7, 8.]

combination of sounds, according to the laws of music, symbolized the harmonious working together of the members of the commonwealth, under the moral and civil law. Music was the fittest means of teaching order. To the Greeks at large, every tradition, national, provincial, and domestic, suggested the close connection between music on the one side, and religion and patriotism on the other. Music added splendor and interest to the sacred and national games celebrated at Olympia, Delphi, and Corinth. Soul-stirring music invested the rites of Apollo and Dionysius with solemnity and impressiveness. Music, sad or gay, resounded at Greek weddings and funerals, their vintage and harvest festivals. The sacred hymns, which the father had helped to sing in his youth, he taught or had taught to his sons, who handed them down to their children. The needs of Greek worship naturally made music a part of education, and a powerful means of teaching piety, morals, and love of country to the young. Let us call to mind the soul-stirring effects of the Marseillaise, or Haydn's Austrian Hymn, or the lasting influence exercised on the German or Italian maiden by some hymn to the Madonna which she learnt in her childhood. We can then understand how their grave and majestic hymns moulded the spirit of the simple and impressible sons of Hellas. Of course, it was not music alone that achieved this result; it was the union of music and undying poetry. This is what Plato and Aristotle mean when they speak of the soul-training power of music. This is what was meant by the music taught the lads in the glorious days of old Athens. At that time, music without words was hardly known; it was surely not taught in the Athenian schools.

The music teacher at Athens was called *citharist*, because he taught the lyre or *citharis*. We have the authority of Quintilian, based on the testimony of the mimographer Sophron (400 B.C.), and the comic writer, Eupolis (429 B.C.), that the same men taught both reading and music. The association of literary and music teachers on the same vase paintings favors this statement. Indeed, in early times the *citharist* probably was, in most cases, also a grammarist. The scholar took up the study of music only after he had mastered the arts of reading and writing. As the citharist's instruction included the explanation of the words of the hymns or songs to be learnt by his pupil, as well as of their metres, the lad must certainly have known how to read.

What were the hymns and songs taught by the citharist? To be frank, the old Greek writers give us but scanty information on the subject. Aristophanes mentions<sup>1</sup> two songs he learned from

<sup>1</sup> *Institutiones Orationi*, i., 10, 17.

<sup>1</sup> *Clouds*, Ch. 967.

the citharist as a boy. He designates them by their first words, as is often done to-day. "Pallas the terrible city-destroyer;" so began the hymn of the famous composer Lamprocles (476 B.C.). "The far-resounding strains of the lyre" was a dithyramb of the poet Cydias or Cydides. The religious character of the former is self-evident. Polybius,<sup>1</sup> in speaking of the Arcadians—among whom music was esteemed as the quintessence of culture—reports that their children, first of all, learned the hymns and pæans, in which, following the custom of their fathers, they celebrate the gods and heroes of their country, and then the more artistic strains of the singers Timotheos and Philoxenos. Annually, at their festivals, they gave exhibitions, at which the youths in chorus, accompanied by the sounds of the flute, went through all the evolutions of manly battles. Religion and patriotism, we see, were the chief and inspiring themes of the songs learned by the Hellenic lad. These he learned by heart, and sang, accompanying himself on the lyre. In the good old times no other form of stringed instrument was used in school. To judge from several vase paintings that have come down to us, the scholar sang and played, repeating the strains first played for him by the master. In one genre picture of this kind the citharist beats time both with his foot and a branch he has in his right hand. That boys were sometimes taught to play from notes, especially in later times, we may safely admit. At the same time, as the Greek artists progressed in technical skill, the simple, severe music sung by the men who had fought at Marathon and Salamis steadily decayed. Aristophanes sorrowfully bears witness to the new-fangled trills and roulades introduced by the composer Phrynis, and to the wholesome thrashings administered by the citharist to scholars who were too ambitious to be content with the plain singing of their fathers. But neither the citharist's birchings nor the poet's denunciation could stop the current of the growing evil. The songs of the fathers, the hymns and the *volkslied* were discarded, and trilling *virtuosi* displayed their new-born arts. Before long the old national music died out in the schools; the citharist was replaced by masters who excelled in feats of technical skill; Greece became the stalking-ground of warbling professionals and ambitious amateurs.

The lyre was the national instrument of the Greeks and the instrument chiefly taught in school. At Thebes, however, the flute, or, rather, an instrument resembling the clarinet, was popular. For a time it was practiced at Athens too; but as flute-playing distorted the face and prevented the player from singing, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Polybius, iv., 207.

soon lost caste. To Alcibiades is attributed the downfall of the flute.

With one further remark we may dismiss the Greek music-master. As we have seen, music was greatly prized as a means of education; it must not be supposed, however, that every Greek lad frequented the citharist's school. The musical course followed that of the grammatist—was its completion, so to say. Many a father, we may be sure, felt he had done his duty to his son when he had paid for his elementary education. Sophroniscus, the father of Socrates, was one of these; for the great philosopher did not learn to play the lyre until far advanced in years. Still, Sophroniscus, if not a wealthy man, was a statuarius of some mark, and left his son a modest inheritance. The great Themistocles, a man of high birth, when asked to play the lyre at a banquet, confessed that he had not learned to play the instrument. He was, therefore, regarded as deficient in refinement, Quintilian says. But when men like Themistocles failed to learn the lyre, we may well doubt that music was a universal accomplishment. As higher education in modern times, even when open to all without expense, nevertheless remains the privilege of the few, so in ancient Greece, in all likelihood, only the minority enjoyed the advantage of the citharist's training.

No part of Greek education has called forth more enthusiastic praise from some modern writers than their gymnastics. In Germany especially, and to a lesser degree in France, the admiration expressed for Greek physical culture has been without stint. Perhaps the slight attention formerly given to the bodily training of young lads in those countries accounts, to a great extent, for this enthusiasm. No doubt the wise educator will insist on the harmonious development of the youth committed to his care, and will not train the mind and heart only, slighting the body. But there is much to be said in favor of Mr. Mahaffy's<sup>1</sup> view, that the training of the English public-school boy at Eton and Rugby is superior, both from the physical and the moral side, to Greek gymnastics. The sports and exercises of the English lad are the natural product of youth and pluck; they are practiced spontaneously, with little or no interference on the part of the masters. They demand far more spirit, more ingenuity in planning, more quickness of observation and judgment, and bring out more physical effort on the part of the participants than a monotonous succession of exercises in leaping, running, quoit- and spear-throwing and wrestling under a teacher's direction, even if we add the stimulating power of emulation. Such games as baseball and cricket, moreover, require combined action on the part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Mahaffy, *Old Greek Education*, pp. 21 ff.

players and subordination to a self-imposed captain. These cannot fail to be an excellent training in many of the civic virtues demanded in a modern free state. We may well hesitate to join the chorus of honest Helleno-maniacs who would go back two thousand years and re-establish universally the Athenian palæstra.

But putting aside this question, let us go back to Greece and study the athletic training of the Greek lad at school. Athletic sports are mentioned even in Homer, not only as a preparation for military service, but as a matter of social amusement. Pausanias<sup>1</sup> makes Theseus the founder of the first Athenian gymnastic school. There are reasons, however, for thinking that systematic athletics under a teacher were of comparatively recent origin. It is true that Solon's laws (595 B.C.), as quoted by Æschines, forbid the gymnasiarch to allow the presence of strangers in the gymnasium, and especially the presence of slaves in the palæstra. But the gymnasium, it is certain, was not intended for schoolboys. The word palæstra, also, though the usual name of a boy's athletic school, is also used for the training-place of youths and men. Possibly, therefore, the law does not refer to athletic schools at all. Besides, the authenticity of the text of Æschines is not above suspicion. We certainly do not meet with the *pædotribe* (παίδοτριβή), or teacher of athletics, until the Peloponnesian war (about 420 B.C.)<sup>2</sup>. We know of no other older word to designate the training-master at Athens. It is very doubtful, therefore, whether athletic schools existed long before this time. At all events—although, because of their frequent wars, it was of direct and great interest to the Athenians not to neglect their children's physical education—athletic schools (*palæstræ*) were not maintained by the state. Like the literary schools, they were private undertakings, kept by the teacher for his own account. Nor were boys under fourteen obliged to follow a course of gymnastics, though in Aristotle's time youths (ἐφηβοί) took a prescribed course of athletics as a part of their military drill,<sup>3</sup> as is done in Germany to-day. The lads received a daily stipend from the state while undergoing the ephêbic training, as did, likewise, their teachers. But this was towards the end of the fourth century B.C. Moreover, not until 300 B.C. do we meet with any trace of the Attic *ephēby* either in our authors or in the inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> if we except Aristotle's newly-found works. But we are not now concerned with the *ephēbi*, but with schoolboys and their gymnastic training.

Aristotle<sup>5</sup> advocates physical culture as the very starting point

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias, i., 39, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 973.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, § 42.

<sup>4</sup> A. Dumont, *Essai sur l'Ephêbiè Attique*, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.*, viii., 3.

of education. Plato, too, in his *Laws*, advises that a boy's gymnastic training should begin in his seventh year.<sup>1</sup> Grasberger and others inferred from this that the athletic school was the very first school to which Greek boys were sent. Later writers, however, regard this inference as hasty. Notwithstanding the great genius of these two philosophers, their views on politics and education seem to have received little recognition in practice. In any case we have no evidence to prove that their views on early physical training were accepted anywhere in Greece. A comparison of vase pictures representing training and other schools leads Girard<sup>2</sup> to conclude that the scholars of pædotribes represented on these pictures are older, not younger, than the grammatists' pupils. The young athletes are from fourteen to seventeen years of age. Only after they had been taught by the grammarist for some time, therefore, did the Greek lads take up the athletic courses.

The place where school-boys were taught gymnastics was called the *palæstra*. The name *gymnasium* was given to the physical training-schools of youths and adults. At first the *palæstra* was simply a piece of open ground set apart for the pædotribe's use; later the open ground was surrounded by a covered porch for protection against rain. Here the pupils were taught to practice leaping, wrestling, throwing quoits (*discus*) and spears. Strange to say, according to Grasberger, what chiefly distinguished the gymnasium from the *palæstra* was the absence of a race-course in the latter. It appears incredible that running should be wanting in the athletic exercises of the younger boys. Mahaffy, therefore, is probably right in assuming that the race-course lay just outside of the *palæstra*. If we enter a *palæstra* or gymnasium the first objects we remark are some statues of a bearded god. They represent Hermes, the guardian god of the young. At Athens, as at Rome, the gods are omnipresent. At one side we see a sinewy man with a light mantle (the *chlamys*) thrown over his shoulder and armed with a rod. It is the pædotribe, and his cane is an ominous threat to the unruly and the unskilful. The *palæstra*, as well as the race-course, is well covered with loose sand. This protects the practising youngsters against bodily hurt. The boys,—and this is equally true of the young men and adults in the gymnasium,—are completely stripped. Some are engaged in sports, others stand chatting or squat on the sand. See yonder lad just preparing to leap! Young slaves are rubbing him vigorously with sweet oil, the regular preliminary of all athletics. What sounds are those we hear from yonder corner? A fifer's ringing notes

<sup>1</sup> Plato, *De Legibus*, vii., p. 794.

<sup>2</sup> Girard, *Éducation Athénienne*, pp. 196 ff.

help to secure grace and regularity of movement.<sup>1</sup> He is ready now. The master seizes a pair of weights, takes position and essays a distance jump; high leaps seem not to be included in the programme. The boy takes his weights (*halteres*) and follows suit. He is a natural acrobat, and generous applause is his reward. Turn again to the master; he throws the discus or quoit by way of teaching another boy. A half hour's attendance enables us to understand the system of teaching. The master shows how the feat is done; the pupil imitates him. Here is a pair of wrestlers. They face each other standing, struggle and writhe, never exchanging blows, but striving to throw each other down so as to make the shoulders touch the ground. Another pair are rolling in the sand, now one on top, then the other. Their aim is the same as that of the standing wrestlers; each makes desperate efforts to pin his opponent's shoulder to the ground. Look! At last the dark wrestler has forced the blonde to the ground three times. The victory is his. Meanwhile, alongside of the palæstra boys are running through the thick sand of the race-course. They, too, are naked. But this heavy sand is a bad handicap. Great speed is hard to achieve. How far do they run? The race-course extends one *stadium* (one-eighth of a mile, three short squares in New York) in a straight line. The first race is already over; the sprinters covered the stadium once. But here another race begins. The contestants are taller and older, and they return after reaching the further end of the course. They have run a quarter of a mile. The young men, we are told, sometimes run twenty-four stadia, or three miles. But let us go back to the palæstra. They are now throwing the spear.<sup>2</sup> Seizing the weapon by the middle, the spearsman aims at a mark, now on the wall of the porch, again on the ground. To guard against accidents the spear has been stripped of its iron head and is in reality but a wooden shaft. The throwing is over. What is the object of the lads running, compass in hand, to the place where the spear struck? They are ascertaining the comparative skill of the contestants by exact measurements. But school time is over. The boys are getting ready for home. Some have called slaves to scrape off the remains of the oil<sup>3</sup> with which they had been rubbed; others are putting on their mantles or taking their canes, for our Athenian youth is fond of carrying a cane. Here two brothers are joining their pedagogue, who had guided them to the palæstra and is now taking them home.

<sup>1</sup> Girard, *Éducation Athénienne*, p. 192, informs us that many vase pictures establish the statement of Athenæus that this was the case.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Girard, *Éducation Athénienne*, pp. 203, ff.

<sup>3</sup> In later times baths were attached to some public palæstræ, but water was usually not plentiful in Greek cities.



So much for the education of the palæstra. We must not forget to mention, that the pedotribe, was supposed strictly to safeguard his scholar's morals, and that the state appointed officers to look after this. The gymnastic exercises, apart from their being a preparation for real war, were supposed to make the body hardy and the limbs supple; to develop manliness, the power of enduring pain, and self possession and sureness of judgment in presence of danger. Ikkos of Tarentum and Herodikos of Selymbria utilized gymnastics for hygienic and curative purposes, and met with considerable success and approval. During the Peloponnesian War there was a palæstra in every deme at Athens. But even in the days of Aristophanes the Athenians began to neglect their gymnastic training, and when they lost their independence its decay was rapid. Even instruction in gymnastic exercise, though athletics are so closely akin to sport, must have its *raison d'être* in utility.

Examinations were unknown in the earlier period of the Greek schools. Closely connected with the classification of scholars, examinations can hardly be looked for where the existence of classes is doubtful. The gymnastic exhibitions, which were the chief features of the Hermeia, a boy's festival, may be regarded as a kind of public examination of the pupils of the *palæstræ*. Perhaps we may take the same view of the Museia, at which hymns were recited by the scholars of the grammarist. Subsequently to 300 B.C. the Athenians were examined in writing at the end of the year. The Teian inscription, of which we have made repeated use, informs us, that in Téos there was a competitive examination of all the children in the village school.<sup>1</sup> That the pupils of the Diogeneion schools at Athens were subject to examinations we learn from Plutarch. These examinations, Girard thinks,<sup>2</sup> determined the admission of the scholars to be *Ephēbi*. The *ephebi* were certainly subject to examinations testing their progress in military science.

If we know little of examinations in Greek schools, we know less of vacations. "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy," is a principle expressed by more than one Greek sage. But what the schoolmaster's opinion on this question was, is not so clear. He certainly disliked to forego his monthly stipend. Probably he abhorred long vacations to the utmost. Kottalos, the young scamp in the *Mimiamb*s of Herondas, knows the seventh and the twentieth of each month, better than an astronomer, and the approach of these holidays or any other play days granted by the teacher prevent the boy from sleeping. We see, there is question of free *days* only. From Theophrastus<sup>3</sup> (320 B.C.), however, we

<sup>1</sup> Girard, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>3</sup> Characters, 30.

learn that the greater part of the month Anthesterion (February–March) was vacation time in Athens. No wonder that Kottalos lost his sleep, thinking of a play day, when only two or three holidays a month were allowed to the Greek school boy.

We have attempted to give the reader a sketch of Greek education in its earliest phases. After the Peloponnesian War and especially since the Macedonian period (350 B.C.) changes greatly transformed this simple instruction. The political revolutions, which so radically altered the internal and external conditions of Athens and of most other Greek States, could not fail to affect the development of education. But the influence of the Sophists, and other philosophers proved even more powerful both in a constructive and a destructive sense. As we have already seen, the athletic and musical training of the Greek people soon felt the effects of political dependence and of the new intellectual forces hostile to the national faith. When fighting ceased to be one of the presumptive occupations of the conquered Greek, the State no longer laid much stress on the military training of its youth. Besides the philosopher, whose weapons are the mind and the tongue for the most part, did not feel the importance of physical culture. How fatal the speculations of almost every philosophic school were to official polytheism is well known. Xenophanes sternly denounced the gods of Homer, Plato thought their morals scandalous, Euhemerus held them to be deified men, the comic poets lampooned them when they were forbidden to lampoon the Athenian demagogues. No wonder that the religious feelings of the masses gradually wasted away, and that the old hymns in honor of Athene and Phœbus were replaced by love and wine songs. But the work of the philosophers and especially of the sophists was not only destructive. In the domain of education they also built up. The work of the grammarist became extended and this was followed by the division of labor. The rhetorical scholars of Gorgias and Protagoras, and subsequently of Lysias and Isocrates, must know more than the graduates of the grammarist had learnt, perhaps than their master himself knew. Intermediate schools sprang up to fill the gap. The *grammatikos* (γραμματικός) appeared, and with him more systematic instruction in composition, criticism and the newly-born science of grammar in our modern sense. Then with the growth of science we meet with the same spectacle which we witness now. Science set up her claims and arithmetic (as a part of geometry), and geometry found their place in the pædagogic course of the ambitious youth; astronomy, too, had its advocates like Plato and Isocrates. The demands of practical life also were urged. Along side of commercial reckoning, short-hand (tachygraphy), and probably descriptive geography, drawing makes

its appearance on the scene. Drawing indeed seems to have been a feature of what we may call common school education. Aristotle, as was stated above, names it as one of the four branches of the usual course of instruction, which to repeat his words were letters, gymnastics, music and *according to some*, drawing. The elder Pliny awards to the painter Pamphilos of Sicyon, a contemporary of Aristotle (350 B.C.), and the teacher of the great painter Apelles, the credit of making drawing a regular subject of instruction in Sicyon. How far the example of Sicyon found imitators, we cannot determine precisely. Sure it is, that at Teos the students of the second or middle course practiced drawing. This fact, as well as Aristotle's remark, proves that Pamphilos and his friends, succeeded in extending the experiment far beyond the limits of their own city. With the methods followed by Greek elementary drawing teachers, we are unfortunately little acquainted. They drew on boxwood panels, sometimes with pencil sometimes with brushes. At times, also, they drew on wax tablets. At Sicyon, special teachers taught this subject, though this may not be true of other places. So much seems certain, however, that drawing did not long remain popular. It does not appear as a part of Greek encyclopædic education, and Quintilian, who wishes his young orator to master almost every conceivable accomplishment from geometry to dancing, does not include drawing in his programme. We may, therefore, assume that it was no longer regarded with favor in Quintilian's time (about 90 A.D.).

To sum up: The differences that characterize post-Macedonian primary education from that of the earlier period are the following: 1. The appearance of the *grammatikos*. 2. The introduction of drawing and probably arithmetic as branches of education. 3. The decay of gymnastics and music contemporaneously with the appearance of professional *virtuosi* and acrobats. 4. The gradual systematization of the schools, both as regards subjects and classes. 5. The appearance of state supported and endowed schools. 6. The spread of female education.

Though it is hardly a matter of dispute that the *grammatikos*, a professionally trained man, taught some of the higher branches formerly in the hands of the grammatist or citharist, we shall not attempt here to define his sphere and describe his work. This, it appears to us, belongs rather to secondary education, and may properly be omitted here. The same may be said of the other branches, such as *tachygraphy*, *geometry*, not to speak of the teaching of foreign languages.

We, therefore, end here our sketch of Greek primary education. On reviewing the story we have told, more than one characteristic feature must attract our attention. The threefold character of

Greek education has been so often commented upon that we need not dwell on it at great length. No doubt it gave to the Greek lad a more symmetrical training than has fallen to the lot even of most modern boys. This harmonious development of mind and body, however, it seems, was less the product of philosophic theory than of tradition and the requirements of Greek life. It is not strange, then, that the time when Greek philosophy, having reached its height, turned its especial attention to the problems of education, was also the time when Greek education began to lose its symmetrical character. Physical culture and music decayed in the schools of Athens, though Plato and Aristotle raised their voices in their support. Why? Because the life of the post-Macedonian Greeks found no practical use for these branches of the old education.

What strikes us, perhaps most of all, in studying the literary education of Greece in its palmy days, from the age of Pisistratus, let us say, to the end of the Peloponnesian war, is its simplicity and apparent ideality. Arithmetic, drawing, geography, even writing, if we mean by writing, writing rapidly and well, were banished from the Greek schoolmaster's realms. Reading was the only and universal exercise, and reading meant the reading of poetry only. As has already been said, this was almost a necessity, at least in the earlier part of the period we are considering. There was little or no prose to read. But if the tree is to be judged by its fruit, this simple and idealistic schooling, which trained the greatest men and the most famous artists and writers of Athens; the men that rolled back the tide of Persian invasion; the men that built and adorned the immortal monuments of the Acropolis; the men like Æschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes, who have been the despair of succeeding poets and the admiration of scholars, must have been well fitted to fosten and ripen the germs of Athenian genius, both political and literary. Certain it is that the introduction of new utilitarian elements into the Greek schools neither strengthened the national character nor produced poets equal in fame and merit to the bards of the Periclean age. Eloquence, it is true, reached its zenith after the new education had struck firm roots in Attic soil, and the new comedy was made illustrious by the names of Menander and Philemon. Philosophy, too, the seeds of which had been sown in the days of the earlier education, and which had produced a harvest of great thinkers from Thales to Plato, is illustrated by the resplendent name of Aristotle. But take it, all in all, the glories of Hellenic genius never shone forth more brilliantly than when simplicity and concentration were the most marked characteristics of Greek education. Concentration means power and depth, while diffusion in

teaching, *πολυμαθία*, as the Greeks called it, begets superficiality and shallowness in thinking, and leads to intellectual paralysis. Perhaps the educational tinkers and theorists of to-day might well direct some of their baneful activity to the study of the simple old Greek education and its fruits.

The importance attached by the Greeks to the moral and religious element in education is another feature well deserving our attention. That the schoolmasters of the great Eastern empires, Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria, should give a leading place in their schools to morals and religion, was to be expected; education, there, was substantially in the hands of the priesthood. But in Greece, where the state left education entirely free, where those taught who chose to do so, and where all schools were private undertakings, ethical and religious instruction had its roots in the instincts and traditions of the people. They felt that it was needed for the prosperity of the nation and the individual. When we call to mind, that Hellenic religion was a religion without dogma, a system of ritual, observances, and devotional practices, it is all the more noteworthy that the subject of the most advanced instruction, that given by the citharist, was, in its essential, religious instruction. The bright intellectual, and withal, gay Hellenic race, in this way expresses, in the strongest, most pointed manner, its sense of the great and overshadowing importance it attached to moral and religious teaching. In the palmy days of their independence and prosperity, the Greeks held fast to this view. When the disintegrating forces of Hellenic philosophy undermined, not only their religious system, but their religious instincts; when, as a consequence, the old religious and moral education broke down; then, too, patriotism and morals decayed in Greece, and the sun of her glory set forever.

Lastly, Greek education was the outcome of the people's needs, not of theory. If, notwithstanding, it was a harmonious system, complete and well rounded, this was the result, not of Greek idealism, nor of philosophic wisdom, but of happy circumstances. When those circumstances changed, the symmetry disappeared, and neither the voice of tradition nor the warnings of the sages could save it. Utilitarianism had begotten it; utilitarianism killed it. Should not this caution us against shaping our education chiefly or exclusively in accordance with utility? Utility in the nineteenth century means materialism; and matter is not the principle of life.

PROF. CHAS. G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

## JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.

" Savoie, ô mon pays ! berceau de mes aïeux,  
Climat doux à mon cœur, qui vis maître mon père  
Sous un modeste toit où la vertu fut chère."

THE de Maistre family, though destined to become one of the principal glories of the Savoy of to day, were not originally a Savoyard family. Like some old families of Norman ancestry who, settling in Ireland and intermarrying there became, as was said of them, "*Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*:" the Maistre race (for it was the famous Count Joseph himself who first adopted the particle) were originally natives of the south, and came from fair and sunny Languedoc; whence, towards the beginning of the seventeenth century, that branch of it from which the subject of this memoir sprung, had migrated to Nice, then attached to the Duchy of Savoy.

Early in the eighteenth century, and in the reign of Charles Emmanuel III. of Savoy, the representative of the Maistre family was a certain lawyer, François Xavier Maistre by name, who, after taking his degree at the University of Turin, where Piedmontais, Niçois, and Savoyards alike passed their examinations, had returned to Nice to exercise his profession in the office of the *Avocat-fiscal-general*, in that city; and, at the early age of thirty-four, was summoned thence, by royal orders, to take up the post of senator in the capital, where the king was then engaged in revising and reforming the existing legal and educational systems.

It was in the month of February, 1740, that the young lawyer first set foot in Chambéry, having quitted the olive groves and vineyards of Nice to enter upon the long and snow-bound winter of the Savoyard region. On the posts which he successfully filled, and on the work which he accomplished during a long and blameless life, we cannot now enlarge; suffice it to say that Savoyard history would probably have better noted his name, had it not been overshadowed by the world-wide renown of his son. Years passed; the youthful magistrate had attained his forty-fourth year without even dreaming of matrimony, absorbed as he was in legal work and business interests; when at length the fair face of one of his fellow-magistrate's daughters, Christine Demoty, stirred for the first time the pulses of the sober *Avocat Général*. She was twenty-one years younger than himself; clever, pious, cultured, and perhaps by the very strength of the exceptional education she had received from her devoted father, was

better able than another to appreciate the qualities of the wooer who laid his talents and his honorable name at her feet. He was accepted; and the marriage took place on the 7th of April, 1750; the young couple taking up their abode in the ancient Place de Lans, now Place de l'Hotel de Ville. Here, on the 1st of April, 1753, Joseph-Marie, their first son and third child was born, and baptized the same day. He was one of fifteen children, ten of whom survived their parents, and one of the younger of whom, Xavier, has also left behind him a name in literature.

So little has been known of young Joseph's early life that he used to be written of in such terms as these: "Joseph de Maistre was forty years old. But before that, what? Where was he born? Where educated? What blood was in his veins? What his private life? On all which points his biographers are silent or indefinite in their information." Happily for the reader of to-day, however, a devoted admirer of Comte de Maistre's genius has bestowed much pains on a work which is even now appearing, volume by volume, from his enthusiastic pen, in which some scanty details—all that his most painstaking research can glean—may be obtained. From it we learn that his father and mother enjoying but a modest fortune—having, as we have seen, a numerous family—the home circle was one of some severity, rigorous in discipline and economy. Their father, grave and austere, divided his days between the courts, the church (for he was very devout, and paid frequent, if not daily visits to the neighboring church) and their modest "hotel" or home. The mother—that brilliant yet serious girl-student, whose early days had been passed among rare folios and curious manuscripts, the tragedies of Racine and the commonplaces of Corneille (for old Demoty was a bookworm and book collector)—became, as mothers should, the first educator of her little flock, whom she inspired with a passionate devotion that knew no bounds. Her eldest son spoke of her in after years as "ma sublime mère" and "l'ange auquel Dieu avait prêté un corps"; and years afterwards, when that loving heart had long been dust, he wrote of her to his own little daughter as follows: "I did not understand it (the poetry of Racine) when my mother used to come and repeat it beside my bed at night, and soothe me to sleep with her sweet voice to the sound of that incomparable music. I knew hundreds of lines by heart long before I could read, and my ears, having so early drunk in this ambrosia, were never afterwards able to suffer *sourer wine*." ("Piquette" is the word he uses—the sour, thin, "second shot" of wine, as we should say "small beer.") These few and simple words seem to lift a corner of the curtain which veils his youth, and shows us one glimpse of the tender and sympathetic affection which existed

between mother and son. With him, her "first-born son," as, perhaps, with no other, did Christine Maistre indulge in all her poetic instincts, her literary tastes, and that

"Yearning for the beautiful, denied her,  
With sense of loss,"

which her multifarious daily duties must have given her so little time, in married life, to develop. And he responded to the fullest extent. "My greatest happiness was to divine beforehand what she wished from me, and I was as much in her hands as was the youngest of my sisters."

His loving obedience to his parents is, in fact, recorded by his son and first biographer, who relates that when the play hours (in which little Joseph amused himself at will in their garden, either alone or with his sisters) came to an end, it sufficed for his father to show himself, without speaking, at the garden door, and the boy would instantly lay aside toy and spade, never once allowing himself to give "a last throw" to ball or kite. Later on, when Joseph was studying law at Turin, as a youth, he never read a new book without first writing to either his father or mother, to ask permission to do so.

From the age of five years, Joseph had a tutor at home, one of whose duties was to take the child twice daily to pay a visit to his maternal grandfather old Senator Demoty, who, having no son of his own, was devoted to this, his first grandson. The old man, as we have said, had literary tastes, and lived surrounded by books, and these daily visits, doubtless, tended to guide the boy's mind in the same direction. Indeed, it was thanks to his grandfather's library, which he ultimately inherited, that the future writer became so thoroughly conversant as he was with classic literature.

Monsieur and Madame Maistre were, like most pious people, very devoted to the Jesuits, and early placed their eldest son under the good fathers' guidance, both as regarded secular education and spiritual direction. He, therefore, studied at the Collège des Jesuites, and belonged to one of the various confraternities in which, with their usual zeal for souls, they had gathered together the youth of Chambéry, whom they guided by frequent spiritual exercises, including an annual retreat, in which our hero took part up to the time of their suppression by the Bull of Pope Clement XIV. But before this time a little incident had occurred in the "Hotel de Salino," which is noticed by all his biographers as having made a deep impression upon him. One day little Joseph, who was scarcely ten years old, was playing in his mother's room. It was at the time when the French government had just passed the decree expelling the Jesuits from France, and



the news had now reached Chambéry and was in every mouth. "On a chassé les Jesuites!" Literally, "They have hunted the Jesuits." Childlike, he jumped noisily over stools and chairs, singing, as he went, "On a chassé les Jesuites! On a chassé les Jesuites!" His mother heard him and turned sharply upon him. "Never speak so! Never say that, my son! One day you will understand that it is one of the greatest misfortunes that can befall religion!" She spoke in so pained a tone that the child never forgot her words, and all his life long he stood forth as the stoutest of champions for the order. "I love nothing so much as family feeling," he wrote, sixty-seven years later, in a characteristic outburst at the end of a letter in which he had warmly defended the interests of the society of Jesus. "My grandfather loved the Jesuits, my father loved them, my sublime mother loved them, I love them, my son loves them, his son shall love them, if the king permits him to have one."

At the age of fifteen, Joseph was admitted into the confraternity of "les penitents noirs," a somewhat ghastly honor, as it appears to modern minds, for so young a boy. The "penitents noirs" of Chambéry somewhat resembled as to garb the famous brethren of the misericordia at Florence, and was a shrouded brotherhood where prince and peasant, duke and artisan, stood side by side to carry the sick to refuge, or bury the dead. These brethren of Chambéry were very frequently told off to assist at the public execution of criminals, and it was their special duty to pass the last night in the cell of the condemned, to mount the scaffold with him, and to receive his dead body from the hands of the executioner for burial.

When we remember that not only murder, but involuntary homicide, theft, and other lighter crimes were at that time commonly punishable with death, we may guess that these lugubrious spectacles were not infrequent, to say nothing of that still more horrible punishment, being "broken on the wheel," which de Maistre in his "Soirées de St. Petersburg" has described too vividly not to have often witnessed it. His grandfather presented him with the office book and habit on his entry, and in one of his letters, some forty years afterwards (in 1819), when referring to his various dignities at the Court of St. Petersburg, he remarks that "they," the persons who had expressed some jealousy of him, "are not aware that among my other offices I am a *penitent noir* at Chambéry. It is all that remains to me of my country." It was his first dignity, and he would fain have made it his last.

Hardly had he entered his seventeenth year, when his father sent him to the University of Turin to study law, and keep his terms there, in preparation for his future career. From the ancient

Place de Lans, where his father's house stood, and where he first had seen the light, the clumsy old diligence of those days started at the appointed time on its long, slow journey along the plains of Maurienne, and across the pass of Mont Cenis, into Piedmont; just as the almost as antique looking omnibuses load and unload there now; and we can fancy the whole family gathered together round its door to speed the youthful traveller, and wave their last farewells. "Go, my child, and remember thy God, thy name, and thy mother!" whispered Christine, as she folded her son in her arms for a last embrace. He went, and for three years studied diligently, always looking back with loving regret to that dear home circle which he had left; always keeping up his regular, quiet life, his pious practices, his constant reference to parental authority. He made such rapid progress that at the age of nineteen years and a few days he received his doctor's degree, having previously passed all other examinations with *éclat*, and joyfully did he return to his native city, where he was to practice under his father as an *avocat*.

For a time it seemed as if the most peacefully happy of home lives was destined to be young Joseph's portion. Successful in his legal studies, he lived at home amid father, mother, brothers and sisters, a happy home circle, all tenderly attached to one another, and, practising with his father in the courts by day, returned home each evening to share the happy chatter and common interests of family life.

It seems that society at Chambéry, far from being the uncultured waste which outsiders have supposed it to be, was, at that time, a little community full of mental activity, with its scientific meetings, its literary reunions, its debates, its libraries and its *salons*, those typical eighteenth century centres of culture and *esprit*. Our Savoyard biographer, full of enthusiasm for his native land, complains indignantly that "many people had difficulty in believing that Savoy was, before annexation in 1860, a country like others; they really seemed to think that this bit of earth was a kind of *Congo State*, fallen from the moon. Some asked, quite innocently, whether corn grew there, whether there was anything besides bare rocks in the province, and whether travellers bound for its capital should not bring with them their provisions of coal, groceries and potatoes! And this only thirty years ago! What must have been the popular idea of it a hundred years since?"

Those who knew the little kingdom, however, felt differently towards it, as witness Jean Jacques Rousseau, who spent no less than ten years there, and who testified that "it was Chambéry, and the education which he received there, which made him what he was." "It is a pity the Savoyards are not a richer people," he

wrote, "or, indeed, perhaps it would be a pity if they were; for as they are at present, they are the best and most amiable people that I know." Its social distinctions were most marked. First, the *noblesse*, "as poor and as proud as Job," with their ancient names and family traditions, and the haughty mottoes of their houses; that of the well-known family of *de Sales*, for instance, whence sprang our "gentleman saint," St. Francis, being "*Antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum*" (before Abraham was, I am)! while another saint, the founder of the Great St. Bernard monastery (which, perhaps, our readers, like ourselves, may erroneously have supposed to spring from St. Bernard, of Clairvaux), St. Bernard, of Menthon, boasted as his device the haughty words "*Ante Christum natum jam eram baro*"; "I was already a baron before Christ was born!" Then there was what we should call the "legal set," *la noblesse de robe*, or *la magistrature*, to which our hero belonged, and which formed a class apart, with its own traditions, friendships, alliances, associations. Joseph de Maistre's two companions and life-long friends, Sattern and Roze, were, like himself, of this class, which probably carried with it most of the intellect of the community. His third friend (and friendship in those days *was* friendship)! was the Marquis Henry Costa de Beauregard, at whose chateau, close to the Lake of Geneva, the two friends passed together, year by year, many happy hours.

The commerçants, or shopkeepers, and petits bourgeois made up another section of the community, and one treated with more consideration in Savoy than elsewhere, as it appears that even from the thirteenth century the inhabitants of Chambéry enjoyed the privilege of universal suffrage, by virtue of which they elected among themselves a "great" and a "little" council, which made and executed laws for the whole commune or city. No *bourgeois* could be imprisoned for debt or misdemeanor if he could furnish sureties, and, contrary to the usual practice of the Middle Ages, he was not bound to furnish men or material for war if undertaken by his sovereign on foreign States. At the time when revolution was nearing the neighboring kingdom of France, and its pernicious tide overflowed, as we shall see later, the smaller country, it was remarked that, though speaking the same tongue, wearing the same dress and discussing the same topics in everyday life, the morals and standard of our Savoyards were on a higher level, their manner of life more patriarchal—or, as we should now term it, old-fashioned—than those of their gayer neighbors. The sympathies of the people, however, inclined towards France rather than towards the land where lay their seat of government in Piedmont; and it is remarked as a somewhat curious phenomenon that, while gradually year by year the House of Savoy inclined

towards Italy and became more and more Italian in speech and interests, the people of Savoy, on the other hand, drew gradually towards France, so that when, in 1860, it became formally annexed to the larger country its people were already French at heart.

But to return to the Maistre family; a graft of Savoyard on Provençal stock, which, like all good grafts, bore fruit in increased intelligence and power. One of the younger sons, Xavier, the same who afterwards distinguished himself in literature by his graceful "*Voyage autour de ma Chambre*" and other works, was, at the epoch of which we write, giving small promise of future greatness. He was a lazy, silent, stupid-looking boy; idle over his lessons, *distracted* in everyday life to the point of "seeming to fall from the moon" every time any one addressed him, coming home from school every day with piles of ill-learned lessons and punishment tasks and marks of the canings by which his teachers had striven in vain to chastise some learning into him, until his father, disgusted at the contrast between him and the good, plodding, hardworking elder son, and despairing of curing that inveterate inertia, sent him as a boarder to a priest, at some distance, with *carte blanche* to "do what he could" with the boy. The Abbé Isnard must have been a born educator of youth; for no sooner was young Xavier under his roof than intelligence and energy seemed to awake as if by magic under his influence. Unhappily, the boy had not been there many months when he fell ill with measles. His mother flew to nurse him, and, whether she caught some epidemic during her hurried journey or the disease from her child, was never clearly known; but, on her return home, she sickened of some kind of putrid fever, such as were only too common in those days, and died, leaving her family plunged in the most abject grief. Life was never the same for them afterwards. The sons and daughters wandered sadly about in the desolate rooms of that erewhile happy home, and there, one after another, they scattered, some to convents, the rest to battle with the world.

As Joseph de Maistre was *par excellence* all his life a defender of the Pope and of the Jesuits, Roman and Ultramontane above everything, our readers may be surprised to find that about this time (1773) he belonged to the Loge des Trois-Mortiers of Freemasons at Chambéry, and took, moreover, a somewhat prominent part among them. His latest biographer explains that freemasonry was not looked upon in the same light then as now; but was considered, at least by many of its members, somewhat in the light of a charitable association. Its occult ceremonies and the mysteries which surrounded it made many join it from no deeper

motive than a kind of childish curiosity, and de Maistre confesses frankly in his correspondence that such was his own case. "The only thing that vexes me," he writes to one of his friends, "is to find you seriously talking about that foolishness, freemasonry (*cette niaiserie de francmaçonnerie*), a kind of universal childishness on this side of the Alps, which you also would have taken part in had you lived amongst us, and with which I mixed myself up so little, since I have been taken up with other affairs that one day a deputation came to me asking whether I wished to be struck out of the list."

How far society was, then, from appreciating the importance of its presence among them may be gathered from poor Marie Antoinette's comments on the same fraternity, some years earlier: "Every one belongs to it, and one knows everything which passes there; where, then, is the danger? It is, in reality, a society for doing good, and for enjoyment. They eat a great deal, and make speeches, and sing. It is by no means a society of declared atheists, for, I am told, the name of God is in all their mouths. They are very charitable to the poor." . . . And so on.

Much the same language has been used, in later years of the English Good Templars, and, as ignorantly, no doubt; but the Church has known how to deal with both. As we are on the subject, we may, for a moment, look forward to some years later, when the Comte de Maistre, with the mature judgment of a man of fifty-six, thus writes from St. Petersburg to a friend on the same question: "I am going to tell you to-day about a temptation which I have resisted, like St. Anthony. The Freemasons are going on here *a furia*, like everything else which is done in this country. I have been invited to join one of their new lodges; but, notwithstanding my extreme desire to know what is done there, I have refused, all reflections made, for several reasons, of which I will give you the two principal ones. First of all, I was aware that the Emperor has only reluctantly allowed these meetings; he yielded to his invincible reluctance to interfere with the individual liberty of his subjects, or hinder them making any arrangements they like. Secondly, I have found that many people (and some of the best) think evil of this association, and look on it as a revolutionary engine. So, it appears to me that one ought not to take an unnecessary step which alarms many sensible people. It costs me something, I assure you, not to be able to look into what is going on there."

But to return to the days of the Loge des Trois Mortiers, or Loge Blanche, as it appears to have been sometimes called. When the first echoes of Revolution were rumbling in the distance, and secret societies of all descriptions became more and

more numerous, the king (of Piedmont) grew uneasy on the subject of the Freemasons of Chambéry. Joseph de Maistre, their "Grand Orator," was despatched to Turin to submit to his majesty the list of names of their members, and, on reading it, the king remarked, "These names suffice to reassure me; but as at present all meetings, merely as meetings, are undesirable, they must no longer be held." The members of the Lodge in question replied by sending another deputy to assure his majesty, on the honor of each and all, that they would meet no more without his permission; and so, for the time being, this episode was at an end. De Maistre acted openly and loyally throughout; yet it seems, that ever after he had many enemies, and was looked upon with suspicion in quarters where he might have expected to meet with the approbation and appreciation which were undoubtedly his due. No one was ever more loyal, more Catholic, more clear-sighted in his repudiation of "the new doctrines," than de Maistre, yet, he was reported to his own government as a "dangerous character, full of the new ideas," and his official career suffered in consequence; as, but for the prejudice against him, he would undoubtedly have been named President of the Senate of Savoy.

In the year 1775, the quiet little town of Chambéry—a capital, indeed, but a dethroned and empty capital, since its sovereigns had long removed their seat of government to Turin—saw its last pageant of semi-mediæval grandeur. The then king, Victor Amadeus III., a weak but amiable monarch, whom some have compared to the unhappy Louis XVI. of France, came with great pomp and splendor, surrounded by all his court, to celebrate the marriage of the Prince of Piedmont, his heir, with *Madame Clotilde de France*. It was the third royal marriage which had had taken place between the houses of France and Savoy within the short space of four years, and there were not wanting those among the king's Piedmontese subjects who viewed this "triple alliance" with profound dissatisfaction, grumbling among themselves that, "nous voilà Français au moins pour trois générations." It was, in fact, from this time that the cabinet of Turin was suspected of harboring designs of bartering their fair provinces of Nice and Savoy to their stronger neighbors, "for a consideration," a geographical rectification of frontier lines which, as we know, time eventually brought about.

However, in this bright month of August, 1775, all was feasting and merriment in the good town of Chambéry. The king sold one of his palaces in Lyons, and spent the money in entertainments and fêtes at Chambéry, while his liege subjects there almost rivalled him in the extravagance of their expenditure, giving rise to a *bon mot* which has survived the lapse of time: "Ils ne

font que ce qu'ils doivent," remarked a lady of his court, in answer to the king's expressed surprise and gratification at the welcome accorded to him, "Oui, mais ils doivent, peut-être, ce qu'ils font," replied the king.

So the fountains ran wine—there, in that very Place de l'Hotel de Ville which the bourgeois of to-day trip lightly across, with their laden baskets of vegetables and fruit, their armsful of big waving *cardon*, their nets of salad and eggs; and all the long summer nights each house was illuminated, and its inhabitants danced and sang. The municipality ordered "two lighted candles in each window, under penalty of a fine," the people spontaneously placed double and treble that amount, and all went merrily. All through Savoy the rejoicings spread, among others in that brave little town of Rumilly—between Annecy and Aix—which, when summoned to yield before French armies in 1630, and warned that Chambéry and Annecy, its neighbors, had opened their gates, answered proudly "E capoë!" ("And if so?" or, as we should say, "what of that?") and yielded to force only, after a heroic resistance. Its haughty little saying became the motto of the town.

Monsieur le President Maistre was, of course, among the officials who presented addresses and solicitations to the king on his arrival and on the royal marriage. The visit was, as usual with the House of Savoy, a singular mixture of solemnity and familiarity; of etiquette and goodfellowship; these Savoyard kings, the wolf-princes as M. Thiers called them, were always *pères de famille* with their people; and this visit was said to have done much towards bringing back the spirit of loyalty among the people of Chambéry, who for some years previously had been somewhat estranged from their sovereign, on account of the incessant petty squabbles between themselves and the Piedmontese. The Italians frowned—the king was flattered, at the delicate attentions showered upon the Royal circle by all classes, during his visit; yet on leaving, he somewhat impatiently remarked that "these Savoyards are never contented; if it rained *sequins*, they would say that 'le bon Dieu' was breaking their slates."

Our Joseph Maistre, the staid young advocate whom we can picture moving here and there beside his lively friend the Chevalier Roze, helping to gather material for the latter's lengthy description of these gay doings which is still extant, was one among this animated crowd; now gazing reverentially at some bevy of court dames, now penetrating, with beating heart, into the interior of the palace where the lowest of his subjects is free to enter, and watch his master at his repast, "et s'enivrer du plaisir de le voir," as he wrote afterwards of that, to him, blissful period; and was not the least loyal of the Savoyard subjects of that "roi très bon."

He was only twenty-one years old, enthusiastic and impressionable, and this unwonted pageant, which came into their slow and sombre lives like a ray from another world, inspired him with his first work, a long and somewhat quaint treatise, called "L'Eloge de Victor Amadée III."

It is a touching little work. Touching, in its strange simplicity, its fervent loyalty, its unshaken faith. It seems like the last cry ever to be heard in this world of the old, loyal, unreasoning devotion of subjects to their "King by Divine Right." The fidelity of the Jacobite to the House of Stuart; the blind belief of the France of yesterday in Louis le Bienaimé; the shout of the Hungarian peasants before their woman-king; the old guard living in the smile or frown of their idol-emperor; and the Russian peasantry who, alone of all the peoples of to-day, still love, still believe in, their White Czar . . . all this dead feudalism finds words in the youthful effusion of the future politician-prophet of courts and kings, on the eve of the first of revolutions.

To him, perhaps last of all modern writers, the king is "the Father of his people." Are there injustices? Are there abuses? The words "I will go and tell the king" arrests the most daring of ill-doers. Does the king, in his royal progress, remark on the poverty of some hamlet? "Sire," says a peasant, "there are no more sorrows when thou art amongst us; when one sees thee, one forgets one's misfortunes." "Oh! Prince," he cries out again, "rest on the heart of thy subjects; they are faithful to thee! Never wilt thou be safer than while we are around thee! When thou didst appear in the theatre, no one had eyes for aught save thee, and even beauty marvelled to find itself despoiled of its rights!"

As kindred spirits love to foregather, so Joseph de Maistre's friends, like himself, were much affected by the *cacoethes scribendi*, and loved to record their impressions in writing. Roze was a poet, and all three scribbled marginal notes and voluminous journals on every book and event which traversed their somewhat monotonous lives. It is thus that we are able to glean a very distinct account of the way in which they, and especially de Maistre, passed their days.

He was living, we may recollect, in his father's family house, the place of his birth, in the Place de Lans; for families seldom moved in those days; and here, rising summer and winter alike no later than four o'clock A.M., de Maistre, "after having offered his morning prayer to God, before the portrait of his beloved mother," shut himself up in his one refuge, "sa chère bibliothèque, son monde," to feast upon its treasures in solitude. We have already seen how his maternal grandfather, old Counsellor Demoty, had bequeathed to Joseph his much prized library of an-



cient volumes. The grandson added, from his own pocket money, many a volume more, and later on in life a further legacy from an acquaintance still further swelled their ranks; so that, as he recorded in his journal, "the Abbé Victor has left me his library, composed of 1132 volumes in 275 works, and calculating their worth at two-thirds of their original price, they represent 3680 livres. So that to-day, 24th September, 1791, my library, composed of 2534 volumes, is worth 8880 livres."

Surrounded then, by his beloved books, the future author read daily for several hours before betaking himself to his legal work, and thus laid the foundation of that profound classical knowledge which afterwards stood him in good stead. He read and studied at this time on an average never less than fifteen hours a day, only varying the occupation of his time by turning from Latin to algebra, or from law to Greek. He read English fluently, though he could not speak it, and we are told that not only was he conversant with all the classics in English literature, but that he and his two friends, like many of the youths of that day, followed with keen interest the struggle for independence then going on in America. He was gifted with a remarkable memory, and it is related that when only a schoolboy he learned by heart a whole book of the *Æneid* within twenty-four hours, and repeated it triumphantly to his schoolmates in answer to their challenge. Not long before his death some one reminded him of this boyish exploit, and he smilingly replied, "I believe I could repeat it as well now as I did then." As he read, he covered the margins of his books with notes and comments, and reading thus, pen in hand, he delighted in making numerous extracts, in true student fashion, the benefit of which he reaped in later years, for when, under other circumstances, he was forced to move from place to place and leave his beloved "bibliothèque" behind him, these volumes of extracts accompanied his wanderings and in some degree supplied its place, while their transcription had already served their purpose in storing and strengthening his memory.

He used to say himself that his brain was "a great bureau with numberless drawers, in which all sorts of information was stored up, to be drawn out at will." This was, in fact, the seedtime of his mental life, to be succeeded by a brilliant literary harvest. Theology, science, philosophy, history, politics, literature, all had their places in these "little drawers," drawn from readings in Greek, Latin, French, English, Italian, and German, all of which languages he read fluently.

Yet, like all geniuses, he was not altogether happy in his solitude. The mediocrity of his native town wearied him; its everyday gossip and narrow interests irritated the impatient young

soul whose keen glance roamed over two continents; and in a letter to his brother many years afterwards, he thus gave words to the thoughts of his youth: "Sometimes, I recall the days when, seeing myself surrounded in a narrow circle, by *small* men and *small* things, I said within myself, 'Am I condemned to live and die here, like an oyster on his rock?' And the thought made me suffer. I felt crushed by the *great weight of nothingness* round me. Yet there were compensations. I had but to go out of my room to find you, my good, true friends. Here (St. Petersburg) everything is great, but I am alone."

Though his legal studies were not the most congenial of those to which he gave himself, young Joseph was an "exemplary magistrate"; and in the discourse pronounced by him in his turn before the Savoyard Senate in 1774, "on the external characteristics of the magistrate and his means of winning public confidence," he paints his own ideal of what a magistrate should be. "If our first duty is to *be* just," he writes, "our second is to *appear* just before others; and whatever may be the inflexibility of our principles, as long as the public has the right to disbelieve in them, it has also the right to despise us." As one of his commentators observes, this profound remark of the youthful lawyer is the more striking, in that it appeals to the judgment of public opinion, which, as he feels, is to *judge the judge*, and force him to rise superior, not only to public accusation but to public suspicion. His frequent insistence on the axiom that rulers and lawgivers above all men should not be too blindly led by the spirit of the age (for) "each age manifests a special characteristic, always pushed to extremes, so that it is impossible to give oneself blindly up to the general impulsion, without showing feebleness or ignorance," forms the keynote to much of his future writings. One feels that he was, as are so many men of genius, in advance of his age, and that if Dame Nature, who, as he sometimes jestingly said, "had dropped him from her apron *by accident* in Savoy, when on her way to France," had brought him into the world some fifty years later, his reflective mind and too sensitive heart might have had freer play. Unlike his inflexible father, he was too humane for his post, and the "over-frequent procession of *penitents noirs* accompanying some malefactor to the place of execution, sometimes for such trifling offences as a theft of 300 francs, or violences committed during a fit of lunacy, roused his sorrowful indignation, "even though," as he wrote, "our magistrature, more humane than that of France, tempered justice with mercy by first strangling those who were condemned to be broken alive upon the wheel."

If, however, de Maistre's legal duties were not altogether congenial to him, he was not so absorbed in his literary studies as to

be averse to society, or to the gentle recreations of such diversions as the aristocracy of Chambéry permitted itself; of which we encounter a somewhat curious specimen, described by the young lawyer as one of the "journées anglaises" (!) in which *le high-life* of Chambéry, as his biographer phrases it, diverted itself.

"We met at midday to separate again at four o'clock in the morning. On my honor, I don't understand it. The more we are ruined, the grander we become. Well, first there was tea, coffee, chocolate, butter, etc. Then games and concerts. At five o'clock dinner was served; sixty-five persons at the principal table and thirty more beside it; and on the table all the first chapter of Genesis. All that climbs, all that swims, all that flies, all that sings, all that bellows, all that brays, was there. To amuse you, I send you the menu. One hundred persons served on silver (even the plates), the dessert served in plated silver, as also the knives, forks, and spoons. Then came the ball, with all sorts of bonbons *à la macedoine*."

The young lawyer seems to have been popular in society, and was already appealed to as an authority on literary and artistic subjects. Only on the subject of music he failed entirely; not only was he indifferent to its strains, but it positively irritated him. "I cannot hear a piano played without feeling as if each note struck me," he declared; so one may imagine that his fair friends were not encouraged to display their accomplishments on harp or spinnet before his unappreciative ear.

It was not, it would appear, for any artistic talent or brilliant gifts of brain or hand that, for a long time silently, even as did his father before him, he had fixed his sober affections upon a certain "demoiselle à marier" who possessed "solid qualities, not devoid of charm, and virtue flourishing modestly with grace." For seven long years—no less—he admired, without expressing his preference for, a gentle, pious girl, belonging to the old Savoyard aristocracy, Françoise Marguerite de Morand by name. She was six years younger than himself, and was in every way his ideal, simple, good, devoted, practical, and favorably inclined towards her somewhat precise and sober "pretendant"; while, to crown all, she was without any pretension to being one of the "femmes savantes" who were the objects of de Maistre's special detestation. In a somewhat naïve letter, in which he announces his approaching marriage to his friend, the Marquis de Costa, he writes:

"M. de Morand has given me a great mark of esteem in never placing the least obstacle in the way of my union with his daughter. I can at last show my gratitude by working for the happiness of *mon amie*. For the rest, you will easily believe that *marriage, for the tolerably wise man, is undertaken, like one's salvation, in fear and*

*trembling.* Oh! what hostages one gives to fortune the day one says 'yes,' if that jade chooses to plague you. But this is not the sort of thing to think of at this moment. My plan in my new life is short and simple; it is, to profit by the advantages that fate has bestowed upon me. I am the first and only love of the woman whom I am marrying. This is a great blessing which must not be passed over. My hourly occupation will be to imagine every possible means of rendering myself agreeable and necessary to my companion, so as to have ever before my eyes a being made happy by me. If anything can resemble one's ideas of heaven, it is that."

Few young men in the present day have approached the state of matrimony with such exalted, yet practical, aspirations. His letter forms a miniature edition of the now celebrated "How to be Happy, Though Married"; and one is glad to think that as far as mutual affection went, their early period of married life was "that of two lovers." They were poor, but content; sharing the ancestral home with "M. le President Maistre," the elder, up to the time of his death, and leading that quiet, peaceable "*vie de famille*" which was so delighted in by the young husband that he is even reproached with being *un peu bourgeois* in his love of home.

While Joseph de Maistre and his wife were passing their tranquil, contented lives, hand in hand beside the cradles of two treasured children, Anne and Rudolph, the first echoes of revolution were sounding in France, and penetrating gradually to the surrounding countries. De Maistre followed the movement with disapproving and prophetic eye, commenting sadly upon the false steps, the contradictory measures, the feeble resistance of his own and other sovereigns. "My aversion for what is passing in France becomes horror," he writes. "I well understand how systems, fermenting in human heads, become passions. Massacres, pillage, incendiarism are nothing; a few years will cure all that. But public spirit, public opinion vitiated, in a word, France become rotten, that is the work of these men. And what is still more deplorable is that the evil is contagious, and our poor Chambéry has become tainted."

A pamphlet which appeared about this time under the title of "*Le Premier cri de la Savoie vers la Liberté*," attracted much attention in Chambéry. "They very quietly propose to us to consider whether of these alternatives would best suit us—to give ourselves to Switzerland, or to France, or to revolt on our own account," commented de Maistre. "Under an appearance of moderation, this little work is highly inflammatory, but the *amateurs* of Chambéry consider it quite wholesome. . . . They are mad!" he explodes at last.

The French government, meanwhile, or rather the Republican army, resolved the question in its own way by invading and occupying Savoy in September, 1792. De Maistre's younger brothers, who were in the army, left Chambéry at once to rejoin their regiments in Piedmont; and Joseph, though in his character of civil magistrate he might have remained in his native city, preferred to follow them to Aosta with his wife and children. As they crossed, on mule-back, the Pass of the Petit St. Bernard, where nestles the humble but life-saving Hospice founded by the saintly Savoyard, Bernard de Menthon, de Maistre paused, and gave a long long look towards his native land. On one hand lay France, the land which claimed his intellectual sympathy, and to which he would fain have turned but for his horror of the revolutionary doctrines. Before him Savoy, the land of his birth, the country in which he had lived, loved, worked for forty years; and beyond it their destined goal, the half-alien seat of his king, to which his loyalty led his reluctant steps, the neighboring province of Piedmont. "My dear one," he said, turning to his wife, who shivered on the seat beside him on that bitter evening, "the step which we are taking to-day is irrevocable; it decides our fate for life."

And so it did. For the rest of his long life Joseph de Maistre was an exile, a wanderer, a cosmopolitan philosopher and courtier, if you will, but none the less a homeless Savoyard.

In the following year news came that the *émigrés* who did not return before a given date must suffer the confiscation of their property, and Madame de Maistre, in her husband's absence—it was almost her sole independent action—resolved to save at least some portion of their children's inheritance by returning to Chambéry. In a delicate state of health—she was on the verge of her third confinement—and in the depths of a severe winter, she journeyed, with her two young children, across the Great St. Bernard to Chambéry. Her husband, agonized at the discovery of her departure, followed in hot haste, fearing to find her dead or dying on the road, but found her safe in their native town. On arriving, he was immediately called upon to take an oath of allegiance to France and to pay a subscription to its army, both of which he refused, saying, indignantly, "I do not give money to kill my brothers, who serve the King of Sardinia!" A domiciliary visit from the rough, brutal soldiers of the republic so agitated Madame de Maistre that her hour of peril came on, and after a long and dangerous labor, their third child, little Constance, was born. Joseph de Maistre, as soon as his wife was out of danger, left property and country to their fate, and retired, disgusted and indignant, to Lausanne, where his wife followed him as soon as she was able to travel.

It was at Lausanne, and at this period, that his literary work began. Having been doubly charged by his king (Victor Amadeus) with the care and surveillance of his fellow-exiles, and with a mission to report on the progress of events in France, his writings soon assumed a position of political importance, and were studied and referred to by politicians of all the involved countries. He there penned his famous "Considerations sur la France," as well as many letters and minor pamphlets treating of the questions of the day, some published at the time, others not until after his death. On the proclamation of peace, he made a short sojourn in Turin, whence fresh political complications caused him to migrate to Venice with his family.

Here they remained for some time, and it appears to have been the most trying period of their lives—their Savoyard property being, as we have seen, confiscated, and the king whose fortunes they followed unable to maintain his loyal supporters.

"My father, my mother, my brother and my sister lived for four years on the small sum of 3000 francs saved out of the Jacobin confiscation," writes Constance de Maistre, in her description of that time. She herself was living with her maternal grandmother in Savoy; for having been too young to accompany her parents in their first flight to Lausanne, she remained separated from them for no less than twenty years.

"My mother cooked, my sister swept, my brother brought the daily charcoal for the fire in a little basket, and all was regulated with the strictest economy. My mother was at her last louis when my father was summoned to Sardinia."

Once more Count Joseph re-entered on political life and active work, as "Regent de la Chancellerie" in Sardinia—a post which was, in fact, that of chief magistrate of the island. Here he remained until 1802, and must have had a hard and uncongenial task in that island of lawlessness and *vendetta*, where his principal duties consisted in wresting taxes from unwilling landowners. In 1802 a decree was passed by the French republic, enjoining on all the exiled *émigrés* to return to their country within a given period, and in the meanwhile to tender the oath of allegiance to the republic before the nearest French government representative. De Maistre considered this a favorable opportunity for addressing a memorandum to the French ambassador at Naples, in which he stated: "That he was not born a Frenchman, that he never would become one, and that never having set foot in the countries conquered by France, he could not have become one . . . and having followed the king, his master, in all his misfortunes, his intention was to die in his service; and if by this declaration he would be struck out of the list of *émigrés* as a foreigner, and obtain eventu-

ally liberty to revisit his friends and his birthplace, this favor—or, rather, this act of justice—would be precious to him."

No answer was given to this protest at the time, but some two or three years later, when de Maistre had completely forgotten the whole affair, he received, to his surprise, a ministerial dispatch from the French consul at Naples, informing him that "his name was struck out of the *liste des émigrés*, and that he was authorized to re-enter France without taking the oath, with liberty to remain in the service of the King of Sardinia."

Meanwhile, in this same year (1802), Comte de Maistre was transferred by his sovereign, the king of Piedmont, to a still more honorable post, that of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at the court of Russia, where he now took up his abode. The appointment was in some ways calculated to afford him more pain than pleasure, inasmuch as the too slender emoluments attached to the office did not allow of his bringing his wife and children to "that expensive capital," St. Petersburg. And thus the home life which he so prized was again interrupted for many years. It is partly to this very separation from wife and children that we are indebted for one of the most charming collections of private letters the world has become possessed of since those of Madame de Sevigné, which, indeed, they resemble. His letters to his two daughters, Adèle and Constance, as well as to other intimate friends, form a collection unrivalled for charm and simplicity of style and the expression of paternal, as de Sevigné's are of maternal, tenderness, and their publication, in 1851, have tended far more than any of his more ambitious writings to make his name popular. Many even of his political axioms and philosophical theses are drawn from this collection, as the now well-known chain of argument: "No Public Morality or National Character without Religion; No European Religion without Christianity; No True Christianity without Catholicism; No Catholicism without the Pope; No Pope without the Supremacy which Appertains to Him."

These letters being, as we have said, so important a portion of his writings, we may gather a few examples of the various topics on which he touches. Here is one constantly quoted in the present day:

"My pen trembles as it approaches a subject which it has not yet touched upon—the actual state of France. One should be a Jeremias, to weep and to prophecy over her. Say to M. l'Abbé Roman that nations die like individuals and that there is no proof that your own is not dead; but that if *palingenesis* is possible (as I believe and hope still), it is only by the Church. The French Revolution is Satanic; if the counter-revolution is not

divine it is null. But where are the elements of this counter-revolution ? ”

In another place he writes :

“ If I were a Frenchman I should be tempted to enroll myself systematically under one or other of the exaggerated banners, so persuaded am I that moderate systems are a sure means of displeasing both parties. One may laugh at one's own in private, but one must have one.”

Again and again he repeats :

“ There is in the French Revolution a *Satanic* character which distinguishes it from everything one has hitherto seen or, perhaps, shall hereafter see.”

Yet, with a clear-sightedness of which we in our day, with our own added experience, can scarce realize the rarity in his, he half divined, half prophesied the “ good to come out of evil.”

“ Remember my favorite prophecy: this immense and terrible revolution was begun, with unexampled fury, against Catholicism ; the result will be *for* Catholicism.”

“ What we have seen is but a necessary preparation. Must not the metal be melted before the statue is moulded? Great operations are lengthy—what man can watch the development of the oak ? ”

“ I cannot divest myself of the idea that all that we see is merely a terrible preface, and that one day we shall witness events as wondrously good as those which we behold to-day are evil.”

“ Madmen are required to clear out the place, and then you will see the architect arise ! ”

Many of his reflections take so authoritative a tone that they are commonly spoken of as “ prophecies,” and the prophetic utterances of de Maistre, or “ Joseph de Maistre as a prophet,” are terms constantly to be found in French Catholic writers of to-day ; but to the modern reader the “ *tournure spirituelle* ” of some of some of his comments on the existing state of things form their chief charm, as where he writes :

“ The present state of Europe inspires horror, and that of France in particular is inconceivable. . . . The only difference which I can see between this epoch and that of Robespierre is that then heads fell, but now they are turned.”

One of his most often quoted “ predictions ” runs as follows, and is sufficiently remarkable in the light of after events :

“ The religious spirit, which is not at all extinct in France, will make an effort proportionate to the pressure put upon it, according to the nature of *all elastic fluids*. It will uplift mountains ; it will work miracles. The Sovereign Pontiff and the French priesthood will embrace one another, and in that sacred embrace they will



smother the Gallican maxims. Then the French clergy will commence a new era and reconstruct France, and France will preach to Europe; and this propaganda will exceed all that has ever been seen. If Catholic emancipation is pronounced in England, which is possible, and even probable, and that the Catholic religion speaks in Europe in French and in English, remember what I tell you, there is nothing that you may not expect. If you are told that during this century Mass shall be said at St. Pierre in Geneva and at Sancta Sophia in Constantinople, you have only to say, 'Why not?'

This was written in the year 1819. A French Catholic review, treating in its current number of de Maistre, gives some curious extracts from his correspondence relating to life and manners in Russia, which, during the prevalence of the present Russomania in this country, has doubtless special interest for its readers.

After lengthy and minute details as to the expense of living in St. Petersburg, and his own sufferings on this head—for, as we have said, he was ill-paid by his own government and unable to afford the usual luxurious accessories of an ambassador's household, or even what in that capital are the barest necessities of every gentleman's table or wardrobe, such as a fur cloak, "which," he says, "is as necessary as is a shirt with you"—he describes the then reigning czar and his attempted liberalism, the customs of the country, its intrigues, its despotism, its strange mixture of tyranny and liberty. "There is no other country where one encounters so much disparity. He who said that there was extreme servitude would be right, and he who maintains that there is excessive liberty would be right also. 'Do what seemeth good to you' is the universal law in Russia; one may even say that there is an exaggerated liberty."

This is scarcely what one expects to hear of the Russia of the last century, and in point of fact, de Maistre avows, in another place, "One makes a mistake in writing the date 1815 in this country; it should be written 1515, for we are in the sixteenth century." And the Russian people, being thus behindhand in civilization, he applies to them a maxim of his own, that "Every nation has the government which it merits." "Everything leads me to believe," he explains, "that Russia is not capable of having a government organized like our own, and that the philosophical attempts of His Imperial Majesty will result in leaving his people where he found them. . . . There are certain nations which require to be badly governed. This seems paradoxical, but it is the exact truth."

He tells the Russians that they are humane, hospitable, intrepid; but above and beyond all, supremely inconstant. "Favor and

displeasure here are like a tertian fever ; they come in fits." And then, " There is nothing virile in the Russian except the bayonet ; all the rest is childish." Their respect for authority is such that " if, by chance, an Emperor of Russia took it into his head to burn St. Petersburg, no one would tell him that this operation would be undesirable—that it would produce broken windows, frighten the ladies, etc. They might kill the sovereign (which, as all the world knows, is not contrary to respect for him), but he must not be spoken to."

Another letter, in lighter vein—but perhaps equally applicable to the present day, with its craze for short cuts and royal roads to that learning which our fathers acquired so laboriously, tells his daughters that " People have tried to invent easy methods of learning, but they are only delusions. There are no easy methods of learning difficult things. The one and only method is to shut one's door, say ' Not at home,' and *work*. Ever since they began to teach us in France how to learn the dead languages, no one knows them, and it is rather amusing that those who do not know them insist on proving the erroneousness of our methods to us who do know them."

Perhaps one of the points on which Joseph de Maistre's attitude is least in accordance with modern ideas is that which touches on his strong feeling of feminine inferiority, and his younger daughter, Constance, appears to have shared our present feeling, and to have resented her illustrious father's dogmatic pronouncements on the subject, as will be seen in the following passages from his letter to her :

" Voltaire says (at least so you tell me, for it is thirty years since I read a line from him), that ' women are capable of doing all that men do.' That is simply some compliment paid to a pretty woman, or else it is one of the hundred thousand silly things that he said in his life. The truth is precisely the contrary. *Women have never done any great work of any kind.* They have neither produced an ' Iliad,' nor an ' Æneid,' nor ' Jerusalem Delivered,' nor . . . . a Venus di Medici, nor the Apollo Belvedere, etc. They have neither invented algebra, nor the telescope, nor fire-engines ; . . . . but they do something greater than that ; they form at their knees what is the best thing in the world—a good man or woman.

" A woman cannot be learned with impunity unless she takes more trouble to hide her knowledge than the other sex takes to exhibit it. . . . A coquette is easier to get married than a *savante* ; for to marry a savante a man must be entirely without pride, which is a very rare thing to find ; while to marry a coquette, one need only be a fool, which is a very common thing."

His daughter appears to have resented his strictures on her sex, and in another letter he takes up the same strain :

"You ask me, my dear child, after having read my sermon on women's knowledge, how it comes to pass that they are all condemned to mediocrity. You ask me here the reason of a thing which does not exist and which I never said. Women are not condemned to mediocrity; they may even aspire to the sublime, but to the feminine sublime. Every being should keep its own place and not affect other perfections than those which belong to its state. I have a pet dog here called Biribi; if he wanted to be saddled and bridled and ridden out into the country like a horse, I should be as displeased with him as if your brother's English horse wanted to jump on my lap or drink my coffee! . . . Poets, of course, may talk. . . . If some fair lady had asked me, twenty years ago, 'Do you not think that I could be a great general, like a man?' I should certainly have answered her, 'Undoubtedly, madame, if you commanded an army, the enemy would fall at your feet, where I am at the present moment; no one would dare to fire, and you would enter the enemy's capital with drums beating and colors flying!' If she had said, 'Who prevents my being as learned in astronomy as Isaac Newton?' I should have replied, 'No one, my divine beauty! Take the telescope; the stars will be proud of the honor of being gazed at by your lovely eyes, and will hasten to reveal all their secrets to you!' That is the way one talks to women, whether in prose or in verse; but she who takes these speeches for *current money* is very stupid. . . . The woman who wants to emulate a man is nothing but a monkey."

And he adds, somewhat suggestively, "*Adieu, petit singe!*"

On this Mdle. Constance indignantly asks her father whether he really considers women "nothing but monkeys," and he rejoins, "I merely said, and I will not unsay it, that women who ape men are only monkeys, and it is aping men to wish to be learned. I honor the young lady of whom you tell me that she has begun to write an epic poem; but Heaven preserve me from being her husband! . . . Do you think I should have been very grateful to your mother if she had written a novel instead of giving me your brother?"

"L'univers a perdu la sublime Emilie,  
Elle aimà les plaisirs, les arts, la verité,  
Les dieux, en lui donnant leur âme et leur genie  
Ne s'étaient réservé que 'l'immortalité!'"

"And what had this incomparable woman done? Simply translated Newton; whence it appears that the greatest achievement of women as regards science is to be able to understand what men have done."

Notwithstanding the above unflattering sentiments, de Maistre appears to have been at all times *grata persona* with distinguished women. The well known Princesse Galitzin, Princesse Gagani,

Comtesses Trissino, Kasourousky and d'Edling, and many others, women of letters and *femmes d'esprit*, clustered round him at St. Petersburg, and formed a little coterie full of wit and brilliancy; not forgetting the still more famous Madame Swetchine, with whom he was very intimate, and whose conversion he is sometimes said to have taken part in. We must add that she herself protested against what she called the extreme dogmatism of his nature, and declared that it had rather repelled than attracted her when on the verge of the Church.

On the whole, however, he seems to have been treated as a kind of semi-indulgent severe lay father confessor to any number of *grandes dames*, whom he counselled on all the relationships and difficulties of life; marriage, maternity, filial devotion or social duties, all found an eloquent exponent in his facile pen and tongue. He thought highly of the influence of women, too, whatever he may have said as to their intellectual capacity. "The best apostles for the reunion of the churches," he writes to a friend, "would be a dozen women of rank who desired it earnestly. No worldly affair, sacred or profane, great or small, good or bad, has ever been concluded without women."

It is somewhat curious that among the hundreds of letters, of memoirs, of personal recollections of all descriptions which we possess of the Comte de Maistre and his family, there should be hardly a mention of his brave, devoted and faithful wife. No letter to her is even quoted from the voluminous collections made by his son; only one reference to be gleaned in any of his biographies; yet her determined action in the remarkable flight of 1793, and his own description of her, show her to have been "a valiant woman" in the truest sense of the term.

"I am not surprised," he writes to a lady who had visited his wife in 1806, at Turin, "that you were able to get nothing out of *Madame Prudence* (how I laughed at that word), at Turin; there is no means, I will not say of making her speak of me, but even of making her acknowledge that she has received a letter from me. The contrast between us two is most original. I am, as you have already perceived, the *senator poco curante*, and above all, I talk out my thoughts very freely. She, on the contrary, would never venture to assert before midday that the sun has risen, for fear of compromising herself. She knows exactly what ought or ought not to be done on the 10th day of October, 1808, at ten o'clock in the morning, to avoid an inconvenience which would otherwise occur during the night of the 15th, 16th March, 1810. 'But, my dear, you pay attention to nothing; you think that no one intends any harm. As for me, I know—I have been told—I have guessed—I foresee—I warn you,' etc.! 'Now, my dear child, let me

alone! You only waste your time! I foresee that I shall never foresee, that is your affair!' "She is my supplement, and it therefore results that when I am a bachelor, as at present, I suffer horribly from having to think of every-day affairs. I would much rather chop wood! I hear with extreme pleasure her praises on all sides for the way in which she fulfils the *paternal* duties. My children ought to kiss her footsteps; for, as for me, I have no talent for education. She has one which I look upon as the eighth gift of the Holy Ghost; it is a kind of loving persecution by means of which *it is given to her* to torment her children from morning till night *to do, to abstain from, to learn*, without ceasing to be tenderly loved by them. How does she do it? I have always watched this without comprehending it."

It was during his fifteen years' residence in the Russian capital, that Joseph de Maistre penned his most famous and lasting works, and won the position which he now holds in the literary, philosophical, and religious world. Besides a long and intricate political correspondence with the French and Piedmontese Courts, which, as no copies were preserved, will probably remain forever buried among their archives, he published an "Essay on the Generating Principle of Political Constitutions"; translations from Plutarch, two volumes of philosophy in refutation of Bacon, an essay "On the Delays of Divine Justice"; another "On the Gallican Church," various pamphlets under the title of "Letters," on education in Russia, on the Spanish Inquisition, on Madame de Sevigné, "To a Protestant and a Russian Lady," etc.; then his celebrated work on the Pope, "Du Pape," which, it seems, brought him into ill odor with a certain portion of the Gallican clergy, and "even embarrassed the Pope himself," according to one of his commentators, by his energetic defense of the rights and powers of the Holy See, being, in fact, an expression of what would a few years ago have been termed the most ultramontane sentiments, a war note sounded "with no uncertain sound"; and lastly, what is regarded by many as his *chef d'œuvre*, "Les Soirées de St. Petersburg."

The three principal works on this list, "Du Pape," "L'Eglise Gallicane," and "Les Soirées de St. Pétersbourg," however, though written in the Russian capital, were not published until after his return from exile, between 1817 and 1821; the latter of these, "Les Soirées de St. Petersburg," being the more philosophical, as the former is the more theological in substance. "Les Soirées de St. Pétersbourg," is a series of discussions, somewhat after the Socratic method, between himself, "Le Comte," a Russian Senator, and a young French emigré, playing the part of questioner and amiable ignoramus, whom the grave graybeards

enlighten with their experience. As they float up the Neva on a delicious moonlight night, one of the exquisite "soirées" of a Russian summer, the young man, breaking in on a too oppressive silence, wonders whether, if "one of those monsters who weary the earth, born for the misfortune of society" were there at that moment, he, too, would find the night beautiful? From this text the Count enlarges on the old old questions which are ever new. Are the wicked happy? Why does evil prosper? Why does the good cause not always triumph? Or is there some divine plan, imperfectly perceived on earth, which we shall know hereafter? The dialogue (or as in this instance, trilogue), being so flexible a form for conveying ideas, it is not surprising that de Maistre's pen should have excelled itself in touching point after point in debate, somewhat after the fashion, no doubt, in which his everyday conversation and correspondence were carried on; and his companions in daily life afterwards became appreciative readers of these familiar topics, crystallized into book-form. He was considered by his admirers to have triumphantly demolished in this work the theories and systems of the two great English philosophers, Locke and Bacon; the latter of whom is described by a French writer as "the father of modern sensualism," and against whom de Maistre declares himself to have "fought in mortal combat." "Nous avons boxé comme deux *forts* de Fleet Street; et s'il m'a arraché quelques cheveux, je pense bien aussi que sa perruque n'est plus à sa place"; is "le grand Joseph's" complacent summary of his own work.

In 1805 Count de Maistre had the pleasure of seeing his son Rudolph, who joined him in St. Petersburg and entered the Russian army; Xavier de Maistre having long ago taken up his abode in the same country and identified himself the more completely with its spirit in that he had married a Russian lady, served in its army, and received a title from the czar. The de Maistre family seem to have found their Russian exile very congenial, and perhaps more appreciative of their respective merits than their own Piedmontese Court, excepting on the point of religion, where Count Joseph's sturdy Catholicity brought him at one time into ill-odor with the czar, as he was accused of helping on conversions—than which, we need not say, nothing could be more displeasing to the House of Romanoff. He found young Rudolph, though only sixteen years old, already almost a man in mind and heart, and, as he afterwards remarked to his daughter, "it was your mother who made Rudolph what he was, full of faith and honor." The father now continued the work so well begun, and his letters at this time are full of the beloved son; his dangers, his promotions, his companions, his doings; all chronicled with paternal tenderness for

the dear ones far away. One little anecdote which Count Rudolph used to relate in after years, may serve to show with what wisdom a young man's failings and difficulties were always treated. He confessed to his father one day that he had lost a considerable sum at play, and had not the means to pay it. Without a word of reproach, de Maistre went to his bureau, took out the required sum, and handed it to his son, saying, "You know that I have a sister in Savoy: you know her misfortune and her distress; I had, with great trouble and privation to myself, scraped up this money to send her. That, however, was a debt of affection; yours is a debt of honor; go and pay it."

It need hardly be added that Rudolph never gambled again.

In 1817 Count de Maistre resigned his appointment at the Russian Court owing to political intrigues into which we cannot here enter, and returned to the seat of his government, at Turin, to await another post.

Before entering on his next and last appointment, that of "Regent de la Grande Chancellerie, avec le titre de ministre d'Etat," he spent some time in the place of his birth, and joined for the last time in all the Savoyard festivities and simple family gatherings, visiting, no doubt, his married sisters, and staying with his younger brother, Nicolas, who had bought a chateau, or country house, at Bissy, near Chambéry.

Here his name occurs as one of the guests at, and "temoins," or official witnesses of, the youthful poet Lamartine's marriage, somewhere about 1820; and that somewhat imaginative writer has left us an interesting—if, as some say, not altogether reliable—account of "le grand Joseph" as he appeared to the budding poet of twenty years.

"His stature, without being great, appeared so, from the slightly exaggerated dignity of carriage with which he walked, with head thrown back, and a certain air of representation which always characterized his attitude, as if, having all his life 'represented' royalty in a court, he now continued it in family life. He was strongly built, without obesity. His feet were planted with the firmness of a bronze statue. His picturesque gestures recalled the semi-Italian who had had much intercourse with Piedmontese and Sardinians. His costume, always most correct from early morning onwards, was somewhat courtier-like—a white cravat, official dress, cross of honor on his breast, and hat always in hand; he could not have borne to be surprised in undress by the humblest peasant who might come in his wooden clogs down from the mountain to bring wood for the household.

His hair was snow-white and as fine as silk, dressed after the fashion of our forefathers; that is to say, raised off the temples,

tied and powdered, and descending in a long tail behind, which made his naturally large head look larger still. Large blue eyes, luminous, framed in dark brows, a broad nose, firm cheeks, a large mouth, made for eloquence, a self-assertive chin, and a half good-natured, half-sarcastic smile. Altogether, his appearance was that of a man thoroughly conscious of his own worth, and who, without undue pride, wishes to impress it, by his attitude, upon others. His politeness, though perfect, rather held one at a distance than drew one to him. He liked to be contemplated rather than to be approached. Dialogues did not suit him; his conversation was an inexhaustible monologue. He spoke untiringly, and liked to be attentively listened to. During the reply he would sleep a little, and then wake up—perhaps thirty times within an hour—and take up the thread of the conversation again, as if these short intervals of sleep had simply rested his eyes without overshadowing his thought."

This habit of dozing in the intervals of conversation was an old one, which had already been remarked upon in Russia, where "the company smiled with respectful sympathy at these *coups de sommeil*, as their victim called them, these passing eclipses of a great soul veiling its lamps and giving some instants of repose to his *bête*—his lower nature. Every one would smile as, coming to himself again, he would gaily excuse his momentary 'absence,' and then look about for his hat, which was inevitably *not to be found*."

Lamartine continues his description as follows: "His life was as regular as clockwork. He rose before daybreak, began, with prayers and psalms, his new day, and often went to the early Mass to which servants usually go before their master has risen; then he wrote till dinner-time. They dined at midday. After dinner, either alone or with one or other of us, he took his gold-headed cane and went for a long country walk, stopping frequently to make some remark or relate some anecdote of his life in Sardinia or Russia. He was passionately fond of poetry, and had composed much himself, which he often quoted; I remember some of it still. After these long walks he returned home, generally going into the church for a moment as he passed it, and then the conversation continued up to supper-time, as diversified as hearty and as sparkling as by day. This conversation, stimulated by his brothers and nephews, generally touched on his yet unpublished works. He consulted everybody about them, even me, youthful as I was. He would invite me to his room in the morning to read them to me, and to listen to my very crude comments on his style. He stood much in awe of Paris, 'that Athens of Europe,' which was dangerous, he said, to a Scythian like himself. 'What would



they say to that in Paris?' he would constantly reiterate, with a half-defiant, half-triumphant smile, which betrayed at once his self-confidence and his fear of ridicule."

Could de Maistre have followed his own inclination, it is very certain that this quiet, studious, retired life would have been that in which it would best have pleased him to end his days; but the sordid necessity of adding to his son's slender portion, and providing for the future of his daughters, forced him to accept the appointment which, when it came, he wrote of as follows:

"All is said: there is no more liberty or leisure for me. I belong entirely to His Excellency, Monsieur le Public. No more visits or correspondence, but, above all (aie! aie! aie!), no more books or philosophical studies."

After all, this waited-for and reluctantly-accepted post did little more than enable him to die in harness. It was a troublous time, and the echoes of new revolutions filled the air. De Maistre, prophetic and far-seeing to the end, stood his ground in the ministerial council, which debated, hesitated, swayed, argued before the impending revolution, fomented, if not overtly brought about, by Charles Albert; and his last public speech, his last warning cry to his fellow-ministers, was, "Gentlemen, the earth trembles beneath your feet, and you seek to build on it!"

He did not live to witness the social earthquake which he foresaw, but "fell asleep in the Lord" on the 26th of February, 1821, eleven days only before the revolution broke out.

It would be impossible, within the limits of such a paper as the present one, to give any adequate idea of the importance of de Maistre's teaching and influence. He was, as is insisted upon by contemporary writers of our own day, the founder, with his fellow-writer and correspondent, de Bonald, of the great Catholic movement, the new Ultramontanism, of the present century.

For it was the horror of revolution, the farseeing view of its tendencies, its work, and its consequences, which caused de Maistre, who had passed through the very centre of its whirlwind, to seek an intellectual and logical refuge against its "satanic" influence. It had begun with the spirits of negation and destruction called Voltaire, Hume, Rousseau, Mill, Bentham, and their followers, with Diderot and the Encyclopædists; or, further back, with the mockeries of Erasmus; and now all thinking minds sought a counterpoise, a pillar of refuge, to which they might cling in safety when the storm was upon them. De Maistre claimed to find it in the papacy. "Ultramontanism," as Wilfrid Ward writes, "was to be the principle of order and authority and the principle of unity among Christians, as the revolution was among the representatives of democratic anarchy . . . the Neo-

Ultramontane movement represents the growth of those special relations between the papacy and modern Europe which made Döllinger say in 1855 that its moral power was greater than it had been in the palmy days of Innocent III. or Gregory VII."

If any human writing can be said to preface, to prophecy, to prepare the ground for a divine act, so we may say that de Maistre's work, "*Du Pape*," was the human preface to that divine voice which found utterance in our own day in the Vatican Council, the response of the Holy Ghost to the needs of the world. And de Maistre was a layman; a layman who, as he said himself, "entered the breach" in times when priests were overworked and over-absorbed in the practical work of the Church, to "fill the empty places in the army of the Lord." His influence was widely felt in his own day, and is even more powerful in our own. Lamennais, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Veuillot drew inspiration from his writings; many of their friends were "brought up at his feet," as they phrased it themselves. (Lacordaire even wrote of one of Lamennais's works as "an exaggeration of the views of M. de Maistre.") Perrone in Italy, Donoso Cortez in Spain, Döllinger in Germany, Veuillot and the writers of the "*Univers*" in France, all owned the influence and developed on their several lines the initiatory thoughts expressed by de Maistre in "*Du Pape*." In fact, his authority was so largely quoted, even by those who least understood his spirit, that, as Frédéric Ozanam wrote of another modern school of thought, unnecessary to be more plainly referred to here, "This school of writers proposes to place at its head Count de Maistre, whose opinions it exaggerates and denaturalizes. It goes about looking for the boldest paradoxes, the most disputable propositions, provided that they irritate the modern spirit."

One of the greatest English Catholic thinkers and writers of the present day, W. G. Ward, also owed much to de Maistre, with whose writings he was familiar at Oxford, and an interesting parallel is drawn between them by the former's son and biographer, who says:

"The vision of horror which led de Maistre to look to the Roman Pontiff as the one hope for order and peace, was due to personal experience of a life lived through the terror of 1793. And perhaps nothing short of a personal experience could have given so keen an edge and marked a direction to his views. Mr. Ward had also the personal experience of confusion, of anarchy, of destruction. . . . With Ward, as with de Maistre, what had been was but a symptom and a forewarning of what was impending. . . . The Pope was needed by de Maistre to keep order in times of revolution or of political crises; by Ward, to keep order

in times of intellectual anarchy. 'The great thing we want,' says de Maistre, 'is for the Pope to settle things one way or another.' Mr. Ward wrote an essay called 'Are Infallible Definitions Rare?' with the object of proving them to be very frequent, and maintained that this was a matter of congratulation, as increasing the store of truth infallibly guaranteed."

De Maistre ruled "Point de Christianisme sans le Pape"; Ward believed "that a spirit of increased deference to Rome was the great need of the Church in these latter days," and his pen, like that of de Maistre, bore witness to his belief.

"To understand and appreciate Joseph de Maistre," writes Les-cure, one of his biographers, "we must never forget these dates, 1794, '95, '96. We must never forget that Joseph de Maistre was a gentleman, a magistrate, a royalist, and an ardent and sincere Catholic. Without the French Revolution and without Catholicism, Joseph de Maistre, philosophically, politically, and morally, would not have existed."

His Catholicism, as we have often shown, was the mainspring of his life; so also, in a lesser degree, was his unflinching loyalty to that royal family which too often repaid him but with suspicion and ingratitude. "As long as there is a House of Savoy and it deigns to accept my services, I shall remain as I am," was his proud answer to an inquiry from one who knew how little benefit he was ever likely to reap from his steadfast loyalty.

We must not, however, suppose that de Maistre was, as his enemies called him, "the born enemy of all liberty and of modern society, the apostle of a cruel God, of an unyielding pope, of an absolute monarch, the advocate of all manner of bloody ironies, the teacher of all that can irritate or exasperate our new humanity." On the contrary, he advocated a wise liberty, an enlightened discipline, a government (monarchical, if you will, but unprivileged) founded on religion, morality, and justice. "One must unceasingly preach to the people the benefits of authority, and to kings the benefits of liberty," was his earliest axiom in politics, and what better doctrine could he inculcate? Curiously enough, de Maistre, who, during his lifetime and for some years after his death, was taken as an example of all that is most monarchical and anti-revolutionary in teaching, has lately been cited, and his writings misquoted in support of a very opposite line of argument, by those who were only too glad to shield themselves under the ægis of his great name, much to the righteous indignation of his own family.

De Maistre's latest work, which was given to the world by his son for the first time in 1859, is "Quatres Chapitres sur la Russie," the last of which contains an exhaustive study of the varieties of

Illuminism, in his day widely spread and active ; some branches more or less inoffensive, others, among which are quoted the Bavarian Lodges, actively hostile to the powers civil and ecclesiastical. "I devoted a considerable length of time to studying these gentlemen (the Illuminati)," writes de Maistre to a friend. "I frequented their meetings, I went to Lyons to see them more closely, I kept up a certain amount of correspondence with some of their principal members. But I have remained in the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, not, however, without having acquired a number of ideas by which I have profited." We are told that he confessed to a certain amount of sympathy for some "tendencies of Russian illuminism, above all for that which according to him should aid the propagation of Catholicism in Russia, and *the reunion of the two Churches, which was one of his dreams*. This remark comes to us with added interest at present, when the Holy Father has so lately held out a conciliatory hand to our separated brethren of the East. Apropos of this hoped-for union, de Maistre relates an appropriate anecdote in one of his letters on Russia. "Some one must yield. But who? and how? A clever Genevan lady addressed the same question to me some years since. I answered her, 'We cannot make one single step toward you, but if you will come to us, we will smooth the road at our expense.'"

An able French Review, "*La Quinzaine*," has lately received from one of the philosopher's grandsons, an unpublished fragment on politics from some of de Maistre's papers. Speaking of the abuses resulting from a mercenary spirit in public officers, he makes a curious comment on them, which seems worth reproducing.

"Mercenariness (venality) renders a great public service by placing young men in all kinds of posts. It is a grave error to place exclusive confidence in *old* men. The mission of old men is to hinder evil. That of the young is to do good ; and this double destination requires the united action of both states of life. Give the helm to a young man, he will upset everything under the pretext of reforms. Give it to an old man, he will let everything become corrupt for fear of innovation. But as all human institutions hold within themselves the germ of decay, and one must continually repair if one would not see the building fall in ruins it follows that public affairs cannot get on without the activity of youth. Old age learns nothing, corrects nothing, establishes nothing."

The publication, so late as 1851, of his voluminous correspondence by his son, appears to have shown Count de Maistre to the world in a new and more attractive light than before. The well-known critic Sainte-Beuve thus writes of him :

"This writer had been given a reputation for the strictest *ab-*

*solutism*; and he has been called the executioner's panegyrist, because he maintained that societies which wished to maintain their strength could only do so by means of strong laws . . . (but) . . . now we learn to revere and enjoy him who has so often hitherto only provoked and angered us. This powerful exciter of political reflexions is actually going to become one of our acquaintances, and even one of our friends!"

We may mention in connection with the above critique, that de Maistre's life and works are coming more prominently before the public at the present time than ever before. Two French current Reviews—at the moment when we write these lines—contain articles on Joseph de Maistre and his works. Lecturers, in public conferences and before—such well-known institutions as the Collège de France, have recently taken him as their subject, volume after volume on his life and writings appears year by year, some quoting him as an "absolutist," others, strangely enough, striving to extract from his multifarious writings some support to their own liberal theories; and all bearing witness to the enduring importance of his teaching and influence. A not unimportant addition to these will be, when completed, the work now issuing at intervals from the pen of his co-citizen and ardent admirer, M. Descotes, of Chambéry, entitled "Joseph de Maistre avant la Revolution," two volumes only of which are at present published. For in Savoie the *man* is still remembered, while all over France the thinker, the teacher, the "prophet" is quoted and revered with increasing approbation.

The Chateau de Bissy, referred to above as having been bought by Colonel Nicholas de Maistre, in 1818, still remains in the possession of the family. Colonel Nicholas, the original purchaser, left it to his grandson, Rudolph's son, whose widow, an Irish lady, still resides there with her son, the present Comte de Maistre.

T. L. L. TEELING.

---

## THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN MANITOBA.

PRIOR to the 1st July, 1867 (Dominion Day), Canada consisted of two provinces, legislatively united under one parliament. One of these, Upper Canada, was largely English and Protestant; the other, Lower Canada, was predominantly French and Catholic. Prior to this date, and as the result of a long and bitter struggle, Catholics had obtained, in complete measure, the right to separate schools in the English province—schools supported by government grant and municipal taxes in the same way as other schools. On the other hand, Protestants had, without difficulty, procured, in the French province, the establishment of Protestant schools. The year 1863 saw the close of all controversy and the acceptance of this situation by almost every one. The separate school question was answered and forever buried in Canada.

Dominion Day inaugurated a new era in Canadian history. The Confederation Act added two other provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (neither of which had a separate school system sanctioned by law); it changed the names Upper Canada and Lower Canada to Ontario and Quebec; it established a federal parliament at Ottawa and a local legislature in each province; it relegated certain subjects of jurisdiction to the parliament and assigned others to the legislatures, awarding to them also any residue; it made various provisions for the everlasting interment of certain nasty questions, involving racial and religious antipathies, which had vexed the earlier politicians; and the separate school question's obsequies were finally, and with much thankfulness, performed—"positively the last appearance."

Its troublesome ghost was laid in this fashion: The local legislatures are to have jurisdiction with reference to education, but not absolute jurisdiction. In Ontario and Quebec the Catholics and Protestants have certain rights. These shall not be infringed upon; to that extent the legislatures shall be impotent. If in these provinces, at any future time, the religious minority shall, by legislation, obtain any further rights or privileges, or if, in the other two provinces, a separate school system shall, in the future, be established; and if, in either of these cases, legislation be subsequently passed affecting any rights or privileges thus obtained, then an appeal from such legislation shall lie on the part of the minority to the federal authorities. We do not mean to say that these plain words were made use of in the laying process. On the contrary,

several years of litigation, with journeyings from inferior to superior, to supreme, and to supremest courts, have but lately unravelled the statute and resolved its twisted phraseology into something to be understood of all men. This, at last, we say, is what has been got out of it.

Three years after confederation (1870) the western prairies were added to the Dominion, and a portion of them were set off as the province of Manitoba. Prior to incorporation with Canada, the territories had been governed in some fashion by the Hudson's Bay Company, and, as a matter of law, had no system of separate schools. The position of affairs there, with reference to education, may best be described by quoting from an affidavit made by His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, used in subsequent litigation :

"These schools were denominational schools, some of them being regulated and controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and others by various Protestant denominations. The means necessary for the support of the Roman Catholic schools were supplied, to some extent, by school fees paid by some of the parents of the children who attended the schools, and the rest was paid out of the funds of the Church, contributed by its members. During the period referred to, Roman Catholics had no interest in, or control over, the schools of the Protestant denominations, and the members of the Protestant denominations had no interest in, or control over, the schools of Roman Catholics. There were no public schools in the sense of state schools. The members of the Roman Catholic Church supported the schools of their own Church for the benefit of Roman Catholic children, and were not under obligation to and did not contribute to the support of any other schools. In the matter of education, therefore, during the period referred to, Roman Catholics were, as a matter of custom and practice, separate from the rest of the community, and their schools were all conducted according to the distinctive views and beliefs of Roman Catholics as herein set forth."

The transfer of the territories to Canada was not accomplished without friction. During the negotiation between the imperial authorities, the Hudson's Bay Company and Canada, which preceded the transfer of the territory, the Canadian Government sent in its surveyors (prematurely, therefore), who proceeded to mark off the land into sections and townships, utterly regardless of the protests of the settlers. No attempt was made to explain to the settlers the policy which the Canadian Government intended to pursue with reference to the method of government, the recognition of titles to lands, or any other subject of legislation. Not only were surveyors sent up, but a gentleman, who was not at all likely to prove acceptable to the settlers, was also accredited to the settlement, and carried with him his appointment as lieutenant-governor, to date from the day of the proclamation of the transfer. Naturally the settlers protested, and naturally many of them resisted. They formulated bills of rights; they met in convention; they determined to form a provisional government; they held their

general elections; they elected their representatives; and these representatives met in legislative assembly and made and administered laws. Canada, meanwhile, acknowledging her error, sent to them commissioners with many assurances of good will and of respect for rights, and requested that delegates might be sent to Ottawa to discuss terms of agreement.

Should negotiation fail, Canada had meditated the possibility of resort to force, and had applied for assistance to the Imperial Government. The application was answered by Earl Granville on the 5th of March, who telegraphed:

"Her Majesty's Government will give proposed military assistance, *provided reasonable terms are granted to the Red River settlers.*"

And on the 22d of March, by a dispatch from the under-secretary of the colonies, that

"Troops should not be employed in forcing the sovereignty of Canada on the population of Red River *should they refuse to admit it.*"

On the 23d of April, Earl Granville thus informed the governor-general:

"Canadian Government *to accept decision of Her Majesty's Government* on all portions of the settlers' 'bill of rights,'"

The negotiations with the delegates were carried on by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier, who had been appointed by the government as a committee for that purpose. The interviews extended from the 23d of April to the end of May, conferences taking place on the 23d, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th of April and the 2d of May. On the 3d of May the governor-general was able to cable:

"Negotiations with the delegates closed satisfactorily."

To this Earl Granville replied (18th of May):

"I take this opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which I have learned, from your telegram of the 3d inst., that the Canadian Government, and the delegates, have come to an understanding as to the terms on which the settlements on the Red River should be admitted into the union."

Some question has been raised as to whether, among the demands made by the settlers, there was included any request for separate schools. There were at least three bills of rights prepared, and the Catholics say that there was a fourth. The question is supposed to turn upon the genuineness of this fourth bill, but in the opinion of the writer the point is clear enough even if this



bill could be proved to be a forgery. In the first bill (December, 1869) is the following :

"That a portion of the public lands be appropriated to the benefit of schools, the building of bridges, roads and public buildings."

In the second bill (February, 1870) is the following :

"That while the Northwest remains a territory the sum of \$25,000 a year be appropriated for schools, roads, bridges. That all the properties, rights and privileges, as hitherto enjoyed by us, be respected, and that the recognition and management of local customs, usages and privileges be under the control of the local legislature."

In the third bill (March, 1870) is the following :

"That all properties, rights and privileges enjoyed by the people of this province, up to the date of our entering into the Confederation, be respected; and that the arrangement and confirmation of all customs, usages and privileges be left exclusively to the local legislature."

In the fourth bill (March, 1870), is the following :

"That all properties, rights and privileges enjoyed by us up to this day be respected; and that the recognition, and settlement of customs, usages and privileges be left exclusively to the decision of the local legislature."

"That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective population according to the system of the Province of Quebec."

To any unprejudiced mind all these bills of rights imply the continuation of schools upon the denominational system. The fourth one no doubt is the only one which prescribes the particular kind of denominational system which the settlers desire ("the system of the Province of Quebec"); but the first two bills, asking that land and money be appropriated for the support of schools, clearly imply that the schools are to be denominational; for no one would have thought of demanding that if *public* schools were established they were to be sustained by public grants. Bills two and three also demand that all rights theretofore enjoyed should be respected. Any one at all familiar with the great importance attached by Canadians to their various views of educational matters, would not doubt that the rights which the settlers had enjoyed with reference to their schools were intended to be included in this demand.

It is contended, on the one hand, that the Red River delegates, who went to Ottawa to arrange terms of incorporation with Canada took with them bill No. 3, and, on the other, that they took bill No. 4. For the reason already given the solution of this question seems to be quite immaterial, but if other reasons be required they may easily be given: Whatever bill was taken it is clear that

Canada did not accede to all the terms of it. An agreement nevertheless was arrived at, and part of this agreement was (as then believed by every one) that the schools should be separate. This agreement was ratified by the Legislative Assembly sitting in the territories. The agreement, therefore, is the important matter, and not the question which of the negotiating parties suggested any particular term of it. It is quite clear, then, that the future character of the schools in Manitoba was agreed to at the time of the drafting of the Manitoba charter; and it is admitted on all hands that it was the intention of every one that Manitoba should have constitutionally no power to establish a system of which the separate schools system was not a feature.

Three years after Confederation, as I have said, Manitoba became (1870) one of the Provinces of the Dominion. In the meantime the ghost had slipped his clumsy wrappings, and in the Province of New Brunswick was at his old disrupting and envenoming work. In that province, as we have seen, there was no system of separate schools recognized by law at the time of the union. As a matter of practice, however, there were schools which, by general consent, had become Catholic in character, although retaining their public *status*. Rights, held by this tenure, having been affected by local legislature, the power of the legislature to interfere with them was challenged, was litigated, and was finally upheld. Rights based upon *practice*, and not upon statute, were evidently not rights, but permissions only. Once more the troublesome spirit disappeared. Once more the separate school question in Canada was finally disposed of.

The lesson of this New Brunswick incident came in time for the preparation of the Manitoba charter. With it before them the draughtsmen thought that they had forever saved the new province from ghostly visitation, when they inserted two little words—"or practice"—in the phraseology used in the cases of the older provinces, and made it read in this fashion:

"In and for the province the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege, with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law or *practice* in the province at the Union.

At this time there were within the limits assigned to Manitoba about 12,000 people, nearly equally divided, as to religion, between the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. In speculating as to the future of the prairie acquisition, Canadians had contemplated the probability of its future population being principally French and Roman Catholic. From the Province of Quebec

there had been a large annual exodus to the eastern states of the Union. If this stream could be diverted to the northwest, the expectation would almost certainly be realized. The provision just quoted, therefore, was inserted for the benefit of those who might need its protection, and not as has often been said for the benefit of Catholics alone.

At the first session of the Manitoba Legislature (1871) a school act was passed providing for a system of schools suitable to the existing circumstances. It provided for a Board of Education, and a division of it, into two sections—Catholic and Protestant. The board as a whole had certain functions, but the chief part of the work was to be transacted by the sections. The system was improved from time to time, but always (until 1890) retained its chief characteristic of Catholic and Protestant schools. The geographical distribution of the people lent itself to the easy application of this division, for the English and French (save in the urban communities) were very largely congregated in different parts of the province. For nineteen years (until 1890) this happy state of affairs continued almost without a murmur. All but the veriest few were perfectly satisfied, and congratulations were frequently heard that divines who might, and sometimes did, preach against one another in the pulpit, met, nevertheless, at the same education board, at the openings and closings of schools and colleges, and elsewhere, and applauded, in matters relating to education, the efforts made by their pulpit opponents for the instruction of the young. Almost up to the moment of the overthrow of this system did the congratulations and applause continue, and their cessation was due, not to the people of Manitoba, but to certain circumstances which shall now be related.

The nineteen years just spoken of had witnessed great changes in the province. The French exodus to the eastern states had maintained its old direction, and absolutely refused to "go west." From Ontario, however, and from Sweden, Iceland, Russia, etc., a large emigration had arrived. The Catholics found themselves reduced from 50 per cent., to not more than 15 per cent. of the population. Their political influence, however, retained some of its importance, for in the keen struggle between Liberal and Conservative their vote might frequently turn the scale. In fact it did in one very notable instance decide a most important election; which election decided the fate of an administration; turned out the Conservatives brought in the Liberals; and led directly—to the repeal of the separate school system! The Catholic vote was, in the most scandalous fashion possible, exploited and applied to the overthrow and discomfiture of those whose franchises were sought by politicians who swore themselves their friends. We hesitate to

lay bare to foreign eyes the utter meanness and degradation of some of our country's political leaders, but it is impossible to tell of the Manitoba school case and omit it.

For several years prior to the year 1888 (two years before the school act we complain of) the Conservatives had been in office. In January of that year, Mr. Burke, the member for St. François Xavier, was asked to join the administration, and his acceptance of office necessitated his re-election. The constituency was predominantly French and Catholic. Mr. Burke was of that nationality and religion, and had at the previous election been elected by acclamation. The Liberals although under suspicion of being antipathetic towards these classes determined to contest the election, and nominated a Protestant Englishman. Their success seemed hopeless, and plainly had to be attained, if at all, by convincing the electorate that the suspicions were absolutely groundless. To accomplish this the most solemn and public promises were made, and those who had been cultivating and spreading the suspicions were denounced as scandalous calumniators. Mr. Joseph Martin the strongest man in the Liberal party made two speeches in the constituency, and declared that if, when his party came into power, it in any way attacked the separate schools, or the use of the French language, *he would leave the party forever*. The President of the Liberal Association for the province was present at one of these meetings, and was appealed to to confirm Mr. Martin's assurance of the policy of the party. By these means Mr. Burke was beaten. Four days afterwards the administration resigned, and the Liberals with Mr. Greenway as Premier, and Mr. Joseph Martin as Attorney-General came into office. Two years afterwards this same Mr. Joseph Martin introduced the bill abolishing the Catholic schools!

The facts just related are not denied. They were recently proved by the declarations of the President of the Liberal Association; of the Liberal candidate at the election; of the Liberal organizer at the election; of the Conservative candidate at the election; and of six of the electors. All these testified that without such promises the Liberals would infallibly have been beaten. We say, again, these facts never have been, and are not, denied. Since that time Mr. Joseph Martin has been politically promoted, and now as representative of the city of Winnipeg in the Commons of Canada, is looked upon as one of the leaders of the Liberal party in Canada!

The Liberals had thus obtained office, but to the exercise of power two things were necessary: (1) to add strength to the administration by inducing some prominent Catholic to join it; and (2) to carry a general election, and for that purpose to secure the

Catholic vote. The St. François Xavier pledges had done much towards the removal of the Catholic dread of Liberal antipathy. Mr. Greenway saw the importance of supplanting it altogether with a feeling of trust and confidence. For this purpose, accompanied by Mr. Alloway (a prominent Protestant supporter), he called upon His Grace, the Archbishop of St. Boniface, to repeat and emphasize the former assurances. His Grace was unwell. At his request Mr. Greenway made his communication through Vicar-General Allard, and intimated that he would be glad if His Grace would name some one who would be acceptable to his people as a member of the administration. The Vicar-General listened to the assurances and request, and agreed to meet Mr. Greenway at Mr. Alloway's office the next morning at nine o'clock. The meeting took place, and the Vicar-General then informed Mr. Greenway that His Grace was extremely gratified with the protestations of good-will made by Mr. Greenway; that he believed that Mr. Prendergast enjoyed the confidence of his people; and that inasmuch as politics, apart from defence of his flock, were outside his sphere, no opposition would be made to the government so far as he was concerned. Mr. Greenway was delighted. Mr. Prendergast joined the administration. The general elections came on. The Liberals were the Catholics' best friends. The Greenway government was sustained by a sweeping majority, and nowhere was the success greater than in the Catholic constituencies, from which but one opposition member was returned.

We have now arrived at the month of July, 1888. Mr. Martin's school act is to arrive in March, 1890, but we seem to be further away from it than ever; The draughtsmen have taken care with their "or practice" to make such an act impossible; the Conservatives in Manitoba have always been friendly towards the Catholics; and now the Liberals, as to whose disposition there had been some suspicion, have declared themselves also to be their friends. The new friends too have an overwhelming majority; Mr. Prendergast is one of the administration, and there will be no elections for the next four years. What can happen?

To explain the sudden reversal in Manitoba the attention of the reader must for a few moments be directed to the Province of Quebec. We have seen that the Manitoba elections were held in the month of July, 1888, and that Liberals then were vying with Conservatives in expressions of good-will towards Catholics. In Quebec, in the same month (oddly enough) was passed a statute afterwards known as the Jesuits' Estate Act. The Jesuits had for many years preferred a claim to certain lands which had at one time belonged to their order. In settlement of this claim the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec agreed to pay to them

the sum of \$400,000; but, inasmuch as the jealousy of the Protestants would thereby be certainly aroused, the legislature at the same time provided that a sum of \$60,000 should be paid over to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, which amount (with a small increase afterwards made) was to the Jesuit grant, in the same proportion as was the Protestant to the Catholic population. This act was passed without a dissentient vote, and no Protestant member of the house ventured to attack it upon the grounds afterwards so violently put forward.

Although the Province of Quebec was satisfied with the act, a few persons in the province of Ontario formed a society which they chose to call, "The Equal Rights Association." In their constitution they declared:

"That this convention desires to record its conviction that the incorporation of the Jesuits, and the passing of the act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates, by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec; the course of the government of the Dominion in leaving these acts to their operation; and finally the rejection, by an immense majority, of the resolution moved in the House of Commons for the disallowance of the last-mentioned act, have brought forcibly home to Canadians the controlling influences which Ultramontanism has obtained amongst us, and the urgent need of organizing for the defence of our civil and religious liberties; and this meeting of delegates elected from, and representing all, parts of the Province of Ontario, with the assistance of representatives from other provinces, heartily approves of the calling of this convention for the furthering of this great end."

The Dominion Government refused to disallow the act, and forthwith, the "sleepy Protestants of Quebec" (as they were styled by an Ontario enthusiast) prepared petitions by way of appeal to the Governor-General. These were approved and fostered by the Equal Rights Association, one of its resolutions declaring that:

"This convention approves of the action of the Toronto Citizens' Committee and others, in circulating and promoting the petitions to his Excellency, the Governor-General, against the Jesuits' Estate Act, and pledges itself to promote and further, in every way, the signature and presentation of petitions against the said act."

There being some doubt as to whether the Governor-General would entertain the appeal the association issued an address in which was the following paragraph:

"The right of appeal to the Governor-General which minorities at present have must remain; nay the entire Dominion is the proper guarantee for equality of dealing on the part of the provinces with the adherents of the various churches, and nothing beyond this should be sought."

The government determined to hear the petitions, and appointed the 15th of October, 1889, for the argument. Meanwhile, however, the Quebec petitioners obtained some slight modification of

the act from the local legislature, and determined to drop further opposition. This was a great disappointment to the Ontario disturbers of the peace of another province; but the Quebec Protestants would go no further, and the agitation, and with it the association framed "for the defence of our civil and religious liberties," came to an end.

But the evil it had done was not all buried with its bones. One of its chief men, Mr. Dalton McCarthy (a lawyer of great ability, untiring energy, unconquerable courage, and narrow horizon), while the controversy was fiercely raging, happened to visit the prairie province. Manitobans had been almost silent spectators of the Jesuit Estate embroglio, but had no doubt been much interested, and to some extent stirred, by it. In January, 1888, with the help of Mr. Martin's St. Francois Xavier promises, the Liberals had attained power. In August, 1889, the same gentleman stood upon a Manitoba platform while Mr. Dalton McCarthy spoke to the following effect:

"There was something for a politician to live for; we have the power to save this country from fratricidal strife, the power to make this a British country in fact, as it is in name. In order to accomplish this, other issues must for the moment give way. We have got to bend our energies, and let it be understood in every constituency that whether a man call himself Grit or Tory, Conservative or Reformer, his record is clear, his principles are sound, and no influence at Ottawa will induce him to betray his great trust. The speaker was glad to inform the meeting that the poor sleepy Protestant minority of Quebec were at last awake. He trusted before many weeks to address a meeting in Montreal, and to realize that that minority is sound to the core on this question. *There is the separate school question here, and in the Northwest, and there is the French school question in Ontario; we have all the work to do in our various localities; let us do that first* before we seek to traverse fields, before more difficulty is to become encountered because vested rights have become solidified."

Thus was the fire kindled which, within eight months, was to sweep over the province of Manitoba, was to result in the School Act of March, 1890, and was to terminate the friendly relations which had obtained there for so many years between Catholics and Protestants.

Mr. Martin's School Act was passed in 1890. It established what are called (for the sake of concealing their character) public and non-sectarian schools. All Catholic school property was turned over to trustees, to be elected under the new act; and it was provided that no school which did not comply with the requirements of the statute, that is, that did not cease to be Catholic, was to be deemed to be a public school, or be entitled to any public support. Even the Catholic organization was ended, and they were not to be allowed so much as to tax themselves for the support of their own schools. A large sum of money on hand at the time went along with their property. The provisions as to religion were as follows:

"Religious exercises in the public schools shall be conducted according to the regulations of the advisory board. The time for such religious exercises shall be just before the closing hour in the afternoon. In case the parent or guardian of any pupil notifies the teacher that he does not wish such pupil to attend such religious exercises, then such pupil shall be dismissed before such religious exercises take place. Religious exercises shall be held in a public school entirely at the option of the school trustees for the district; and upon receiving written authority from the trustees, it shall be the duty of the teachers to hold such religious exercises. The public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian, and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein except as above provided."

These clauses are due entirely to the power and influence of the Protestant clergy. Mr. Martin's avowed intention had been to make the schools entirely secular. When this was announced the Protestant sects preached, protested, resolved, declaimed and threatened so vigorously, voluminously and vengefully, that the government had to draw back, and was compelled to make the schools to suit the Protestants. The Catholics were numerically too weak to affect the government's course, so the Protestants had their way.

Protestant influence went further, and in the very teeth of the act, which provided that "The public schools shall be entirely unsectarian," succeeded in having inserted among the regulations the following provision :

"To establish the habit of right doing, instruction in moral principles must be accompanied by training in moral practices. The teacher's influence and example, current incidents, stories, memory gems, sentiments in the school lessons, examination of motives that prompt to action, didactic talks, teaching the Ten Commandments, etc., are means to be employed."

If the teachers were all to be Catholic, this regulation would, of course, be, from our standpoint, unobjectionable. Protestants, however, in that case would, if the provision was acted upon, take to the bayonet. As the teachers in the vast majority of cases are Protestant, it ought not to be (but is) wondered at that Catholics decline to send their children to what would be, in respect to the teaching of religion and morality, mere Protestant Sunday-schools. Among the subjects for study, too, is "History—(a) English—Religious Movements—(Henry VIII. and Mary)"—a subject which, in the hands of Protestant teachers, would inevitably be the basis of some very pretty instruction for Catholic children.

Of the practical working of the act, one wants no stronger or other testimony than that of its author, Mr. Joseph Martin, who, in a letter to the *Press* (26th of June, 1895), said as follows:

"When I introduced the school bill of 1890, I pointed out that, in so far as it provided for religious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the state to interfere in any respect in matters of religion. I said then, and I still think, that the clause of the 1890 Act, which provides



for certain religious exercises, is *most unjust to the Roman Catholics*. If the state is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority of Protestants, is to my mind *rank tyranny*."

Such as it is, however, "rank tyranny" and all, the act has been passed, the wrappings are evidently slipping, and the strength of those little words "or practice" must be brought to the test. Lawyers are employed and are told that there can be no doubt what was meant by the provincial charter; that those who negotiated its terms are still living and will testify; that if the language be dubious, a reference to the Hansard debates, and the votes and proceedings, will show what was intended by every one. Lawyers answer that no inquiry into such matters can be permitted; that such matters might be useful to laymen; that lawyers, by their rules, are prohibited from looking anywhere but at the statute itself; that the rules must be maintained; and that that which is plain and well known to everybody else must remain obscure and unknown to them. Justice, thus well-blinded, proceeds to make her award. Inferior Court says that the act is good, and within the competence of the legislature. Superior Court says the same, one-third of it (taking possibly a surreptitious look) dissenting. Supreme Court says unanimously that the act is bad and *ultra vires*, rights and privileges enjoyed by *practice* at the time of the union having been prejudicially affected. Supremest Court (the British Privy Council) says that they have not been affected, and that the act is perfectly competent—three rounds out of four, and the victory to the St. Francois Xavier statute.

The wrappings are off, then, and the ghost again at large. As for the new device, "or practice," it has proved to be completely useless. Supremest Court says as follows:

"Now, if the state of things which the Archbishop described as existing before the union, had been a system established by law, what would have been the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholics with respect to denominational schools? They would have had by law the right to establish schools at their own expense, to maintain their schools by school-fees or voluntary contributions, and to conduct them in accordance with their own religious tenets. Every other religious body which was engaged in a similar work at the time of the union would have had precisely the same right with respect to their denominational schools. Possibly, this right, if it had been defined, or recognized by positive enactment, might have had attached to it as a necessary or appropriate incident, the right of exemption from any contribution, under any circumstances, to schools of a different denomination. But, in their Lordships' opinion, it would be going much too far to hold that the establishment of a national system of education, upon an unsectarian basis, is inconsistent with the right to set up and maintain denominational schools, that the two things cannot exist together, or, that the existence of one necessarily implies, or involves, immunity from taxation for the purposes of the other.

"Such being the main provisions of the Public School Act of 1890, their Lordships have to determine whether that Act prejudicially affects any right or privilege

with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons had by law or practice in the province at the union. Notwithstanding the Public School Act of 1890, Roman Catholics, and members of every other religious body in Manitoba, are free to establish schools throughout the province; they are free to maintain their schools by school-fees or voluntary subscriptions; they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets, without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school. No special advantage, other than the advantage of a free education in schools conducted under public management, is held out to those who do attend. But then, it is said, that it is impossible for Roman Catholics, or for members of the Church of England (if their views are correctly represented by the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who has given evidence in Logan's case) to send their children to public schools where the education is not superintended and directed by the authorities of their church; and that, therefore, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England who are taxed for public schools, and at the same time feel themselves compelled to support their own schools, are in a less favorable position than those who can take advantage of the free education provided by the Act of 1890. That may be so. But what right or privilege is violated or prejudicially affected by the law? It is not the law that is in fault; it is owing to religious convictions, which everybody must respect, and to the teaching of their Church, that Roman Catholics and the members of the Church of England find themselves unable to partake of advantages which the law offers to all alike."

And when it is said that such an interpretation of the Act leaves it a nullity, and without possibility of application to anything, Supremest Court says that that cannot be helped:

"It has been objected, that if the rights of Roman Catholics, and of other religious bodies, in respect of their denominational schools, are to be so strictly measured and limited by the practice which actually prevailed at the time of the union, they will be reduced to a condition of a 'natural right,' which does not want any legislation to protect it. Such a right, it was said, cannot be called a privilege, in the proper sense of the word. If that be so, the only result is, that the protection which the Act purports to extend to rights and privileges, existing 'by practice,' has no more operation than the protection which it purports to afford to rights and privileges existing by law. It can hardly be contended that, in order to give a substantial operation and effect to a saving clause, expressed in general terms, it is incumbent upon the court to discover privileges which are not apparent of themselves, or to describe distinctive and peculiar features to rights which seem to be of such a common type as not to deserve special notice or require special protection."

The Act, then, is valid and constitutional. But the Catholics have another shot in the locker. The charter of Manitoba has these clauses, also:

"An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the Province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

"In case any such provincial law, as, from time to time, seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council, on any appeal under this section, is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case may require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execu-

tion of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section."

A petition to the Governor-General in Council<sup>1</sup> is prepared, signed by 4267 Catholics, and forwarded to Ottawa, praying for the restoration of their rights, and the modification of the statute. The government, however, doubts its jurisdiction. Supremest court has held that no rights and privileges, enjoyed by the Catholics at the union, have been prejudicially affected; and if so, what power has the government? Catholics suggest that if they can no longer urge their ante-union rights acquired by practice, they can at least found their claim to relief upon their post-union rights, acquired by the statutes of the province itself. Government does not know, and refers the question to supreme court for advice. Supreme court (three out of five) advise that the government has no jurisdiction at all; and can, in no way, interfere. Supremest court advises that the government has ample jurisdiction, and makes sundry directions as to what ought to be done. Here are some extracts from the judgment:

"The terms upon which Manitoba was to become a province of the Dominion were matter of negotiation between representatives of the Province of Manitoba and of the Dominion Government."

"Those who were stipulating for the provisions of Section 22 as a condition of union, and those who gave their legislative assent to the Act by which it was brought about, had in view the perils then apprehended."

"It was not doubted that the object of the first sub-section of Section 22 was to afford protection to denominational schools."

"There is no doubt either what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the 22d section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was in truth a parliamentary compact, must be read."

"The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their Lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer."

"Bearing in mind the circumstances which existed in 1870, it does not appear to their Lordships an extravagant notion that in creating a legislature for the province with limited powers, it should have been thought expedient in case either Catholics or Protestants became preponderant, and rights which had come into existence under different circumstances were interfered with, to give the Dominion Parliament power to legislate upon matters of education, so far as was necessary to protect the Protestant or Catholic minority as the case might be."

"Their Lordships have decided that the Governor-General has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the third sub section of Section 22 of the Manitoba Act."

"All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system (the system of 1890), were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon

<sup>1</sup> In Canada the phrase Governor-General in Council really means the government of the day.

which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions."

Four and a half years of litigation and at last we know the meaning of a few English sentences in the Manitoba charter. We know that the matter has become one of politics, and that as it involves the separate school question, the times for politicians have grown stormy and dark—tempests from every quarter, and lee shores on every side; Catholics in this constituency, Orangemen in that, and medleys everywhere else in all proportions; resolutions, petitions, pamphlets and sermons; political barometers and Christianity going down; political umbrellas and all uncharitableness going up; what is government to do?

Fully to appreciate the government's difficulty a few words must be devoted to a peculiar feature of the Canadian constitution—the power of disallowance. In the United States the Federal authorities have nothing more to do with State legislation than with the municipal affairs of the villages. If State legislation be *ultra vires* the law courts will so hold; but if it be *intra vires* "it goes." It is different in Canada. There every act of a local legislature may within one year, be disallowed by the Governor-General in Council—that is, by the Federal Government of the day. In the earlier days of confederation this power of disallowance was exercised somewhat freely, and consequently became obnoxious to each province in turn, as its legislation fell to be disallowed. For several years the railway legislation of Manitoba had been rigorously overruled, in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and plainly to the financial detriment of the province. This mistaken use of the disallowance power had the natural effect of arousing popular objection to the power itself, and to array the general mind upon the side of "Provincial Rights." Dominion governments had therefore grown chary of exercising a power so unpopular, and latterly it had fallen into complete disfavor, and almost complete disuse in cases in which popular sympathy would be aroused. The Dominion government had been asked to disallow the very School Act which we are discussing, but had refused to do so, although it was plainly a breach of the spirit, if not of the letter, of the constitution. The cry of "Provincial Rights," to the indiscriminating mind, seemed to apply as well to a case of disallowance of provincial legislation by the Dominion Government, as to a case in which an appeal lay through the initiative of the Dominion Government, to the Dominion Parliament. The difference is, of course, very great. In the one case the executive at Ottawa sits in judgment, without benefit of debate, upon provincial legislation. In the other, it is the representatives of the people of the whole Dominion, that sit to discuss and determine

an appeal from the representatives of the people of a single province. The provision seems to have much to recommend it, if it be, as it is, confined to cases in which racial or religious questions may arise. At all events it was, as we have seen, much thought of and appealed to by Protestants, when the Catholic Province of Quebec passed the Jesuits' Estate Act. It became in their eyes an odious instrument of oppression only when applied to the relief of the Protestants in Manitoba.

The Dominion Government then had to face the facts (1) that Manitoba in passing the School Act has acted within her jurisdiction; (2) that the Catholics are in the Dominion but a minority; (3) that interference with "provincial rights" is unpopular, and especially so in Manitoba; and (4) that many of the government's own supporters will undoubtedly refuse to follow it in any attempt to interfere. Upon the other hand, the government sees that, although the Catholics are in the minority, they are more compact than is the majority; that the Catholics in defence of their religion will in large numbers forsake, for the time, their political allegiance and vote as the occasion may require. But above and beyond that, as we shall trust, it sees that Canada's hope for the future lies not in discord and disorder but in that unity which can only be maintained, in mixed populations, by a large-minded spirit of fair play, mutual concession and a generous respect for the opinions and sentiments of their fellow-countrymen.

The government, meanwhile, has been provoyant and forehanded. It has endeavored to disarm attack by an exhibition of respect and tenderness for provincial feeling. On the 26th of July, 1894, it passed an order-in council which, after reciting the petition of the Catholics, declared as follows :

"The committee beg to observe to your excellency that the statements which are contained in this memorial are matter of deep concern and solicitude in the interests of the Dominion at large, and that it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Canada that the laws which prevail in any portion of the Dominion should not be such as to occasion complaint of oppression or injustice to any class or portion of the people, but should be recognized as establishing perfect freedom and equality, especially in all matters relating to religion and religious belief and practice; and the committee, therefore, humbly advise that your excellency may join with them in expressing the most earnest hope that the Legislature of Manitoba, and of the northwest territories respectfully may take into consideration, at the earliest possible moment, the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the northwest territories, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist."

To this order-in-council the Manitoba Government made reply (20th October, 1894), among other things declaring :

"The questions which are raised by the report under consideration have been the subject of most voluminous discussion in the Legislature of Manitoba during the past four years. All of the statements made in the memorial addressed to his excellency the Governor-General and many others have been repeatedly made to and considered by the legislature. That body has advisedly enacted educational legislation which gives to every citizen equal rights and equal privileges and makes no distinction respecting nationality and religion. After a harassing legal contest the highest court in the British dominion has decided that the legislature in enacting the law of 1890 was within its constitutional powers and that the subject of education is one committed to the charge of the provincial legislature. Under these circumstances the executive of the province sees no reason for recommending the legislature to alter the principles of the legislation complained of. It has been made clear that there is no grievance, except it be a grievance that the legislature refuses to subsidize particular creeds out of the public funds, and the legislature can hardly be held to be responsible for the fact that their refusal to violate what seems to be a sound and just principle of government creates in the words of the report dissatisfaction amongst Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba and the northwest territories but likewise throughout Canada. . . . The government and legislative assembly would unitedly resist by every constitutional means any such attempt to interfere with their provincial autonomy."

The legislative Assembly at its next meeting approved of the following clause in the "Speech from the Throne" (somewhat equivalent to the Governor's message):

"By the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, recently pronounced on an appeal from the Supreme Court of Canada, it has been held that an appeal lies to the Governor-General in Council, on behalf of the minority of this province, inasmuch as certain rights or privileges given by prior provincial legislation to the minority in educational matters had been affected by the Public School Act of 1890; and that therefore the Governor-General in Council has power to make remedial orders in respect thereto. Whether or not a demand will be made by the Federal Government that the act shall be modified is not yet known to my government. But it is not the intention of my government in any way to recede from its determination to uphold the present public school system, which if left to its own operation would, in all probability, soon become universal throughout the province."

Later in the session it adopted the following resolution:

"While this House loyally submits itself to the provisions of the constitution as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Council, it is hereby resolved that the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by the Governor-General in Council, in such way as to lead thereafter to the alteration of the principles upon which the public school system of Manitoba is founded, will be viewed with great apprehension; that interference by the Federal authority with the educational policy of the province is contrary to the recognized principles of provincial economy; that this House will, by all constitutional means, and to the utmost extent of its power, resist any steps which may be taken to attack the school system established by the Public School Act of 1890 which is believed to be conceived and administered in the highest and best interest of the whole population of the province of Manitoba."

Notwithstanding this defiant attitude, the Dominion Government (its jurisdiction having now been well established), appointed a day for the hearing of counsel for the Catholic minority, in support of their petition of appeal, and of counsel for the Manitoba Govern-

ment. The argument lasted four days, and on the 19th March the Dominion Government gave its judgment by passing an order-in-council, the pith of which is to be found in the following sentences :

"The committee, therefore, recommend that the said appeal be allowed, and that Your Excellency in Council do adjudge and decide that by the two acts passed by the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on the 1st day May, 1890, entitled respectively 'An Act respecting the Department of Education,' and 'An Act respecting the Public Schools,' the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz.:

(a) "The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools, in the manner provided for by the said statutes, which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) "The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public fund for the purposes of education.

(c) "The right of exemption, of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payment or contribution to the support of any other school.

"And the committee also recommend that Your Excellency in Council do further declare and decide that, for the due execution of the provisions of Section 22 of 'The Manitoba Act,' it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid, should be supplemented by a Provincial Act or Acts, which would restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges, of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which would modify the said Acts of 1890, so far and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) hereinbefore mentioned.

"The committee further and for the reasons hereinbefore stated recommend that if Your Excellency in Council should be pleased to approve of this report, Your Excellency in Council do make an order in the premises in the form and to the effect as set forth hereunto submitted."

The order referred to in the last sentence was passed (21st March). It is generally known as the "Remedial Order." It recites the order-in-council just quoted; makes the declaration contained in it; and requires "all persons whom it may concern to take notice and govern themselves accordingly."

The local Legislature replied with a resolution (June), in which it is said :

"We are therefore compelled to respectfully state to Your Excellency in Council that we cannot accept the responsibility of carrying into effect the terms of the Remedial Order."

Much objection was made to the Remedial Order. Not merely was the whole proceeding obnoxious to very many; but to the scope of the remedy suggested, and to the phraseology of the document was violent opposition offered; and it was, and has been, absolutely impossible to remove the misapprehension upon which almost all such opposition is based. For the chief misconception,

the Manitoba charter is itself largely to blame. It says that, "An appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council." The appeal is in reality not to the Governor-General, but to the Parliament of Canada. The only function performed by the Governor-General is the preliminary one of deciding whether or not, in any particular case, a religious minority is to be permitted to appeal to Parliament. If this be true it would be altogether improper for the Governor-General, in granting leave to appeal, to limit the petitioners as to the extent of the relief that they were to ask, and in consequence to limit the jurisdiction of Parliament when dealing with the subject. The Governor-General then was right in permitting the petitioners to carry to Parliament their whole claim. To the objection that the phraseology was unnecessarily harsh and overbearing, it is sufficient to say that it follows the language of the statutes, and that if it had not done so it would not have been effectual for the purpose intended. In order that the Federal Parliament may acquire jurisdiction there must have been a formal and precise declaration of the Governor-General and a refusal by the Local Legislature to comply.

The Dominion Parliament was in session when the resolution containing the refusal of the Legislature reached Ottawa. The steps necessary to give to Parliament jurisdiction to restore to the Manitoba Catholics the rights and privileges taken away from them had now been completed, and it remained merely to introduce the bill and, if possible, to pass it. At this point the government hesitated. It was found impossible to remove the prejudice aroused by the form and phraseology of the Remedial Order. Many who either knew, or should have known better, declared that it was tyrannous, and should be superseded by something more conciliatory. Even many of the friends of the Catholics were misled in this way. The session, too, was far advanced, and the preparation and passage of a lengthy school act would necessitate a tedious prolongation of work to men already exhausted by the labors and heat of the summer. Among the members of the government, also, there was much difference of opinion. Some of the Catholic members insisted upon the immediate introduction of legislation. Some of the Protestant members were rigidly opposed to hasty action. Three Catholic ministers resigned in consequence of the disagreement, but two of them afterwards returned, and the government policy was announced as follows:

"Though there may be differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba school question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba Government and legislature; and the Dominion Government is unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or pre-



cluding such a desirable consummation. The government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session. The government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba Government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that government is disposed to make a settlement of the question which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the 1st Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared at the next session of Parliament to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st of March, 1895."

A few days after this announcement, Mr. Dalton McCarthy moved: "That all the words after 'That' be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:

"This House has heard with regret the statements recently made defining the policy of the government respecting the Manitoba school question, and is unwilling by silence to allow it to be assumed that, at the session to be held in January next, any more than at the present session, it is prepared to pass a law to restore the system of separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the remedial order of the 21st of March, 1895."

The debate which ensued was confined almost exclusively to the members upon the government side of the House, and the difficulties to be encountered became manifest as some of the best men in that party announced that they would be unable to support the government's proposition if made at the ensuing session. Almost everybody, however, was agreed that, as one member put it, "It is time enough to say good morning to His Majesty when you meet him," and that the troublesome question should be postponed until January. Mr. McCarthy was unable to get sufficient support to call for a division.

This brings the history of the Manitoba school case down to the present time. It is to be hoped that the Provincial Government will, during the interval, agree to remedy the grievances. If it do not, there can be little doubt that remedial legislation will be passed at the next session of the Federal Parliament. This may, and no doubt will, lead to further litigation, but the stronger hand of the Dominion must prevail, and justice and right, so long delayed, be awarded to the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba. The ghost must down again.

JOHN S. EWART, Q. C.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

## THE OUTLOOK FOR IRELAND.

THE British midsummer elections have again placed the control of the empire in the hands of the opponents of home rule for Ireland. After two years' tenure of office, the Liberal Party which had come into power on the policy of granting self-government to the Irish people, and had passed a complete bill for that end, through the House of Commons, has been completely defeated at the polls. The Tory Marquis of Salisbury returns to power with a larger majority of followers than he had before Mr. Gladstone's last victory, and for the time the home rule question is supposed to be banished to the list of political impossibilities. That it can be really removed from existence even by a parliamentary majority of a hundred and fifty is however, beyond the hopes of its most determined opponents. The Irish home rule representatives have returned to Parliament after the political cyclone in Great Britain, with undiminished numbers. They have even gained a couple of seats in Ulster, giving them a majority in the representation of that province as well as of every other in Ireland. Whether Tory or Liberal holds office in Westminster, the Irish question will continue to block the way of British legislation until the legitimate demands of the Irish people are satisfied. The Conservatives as a party may care less for activity in legislation than the liberals, but they must move or be crushed by the popular feeling of England. The fate of Irish home rule is then not to be settled by any changing majority in the Imperial Parliament.

Indeed, for the Irish people to give up the struggle for self-government would mean to resign themselves to extinction. The system of government now existing in Ireland has resulted in reducing both the population and the wealth of the country in a degree unknown in any other country of the civilized world. When the union was made at the close of the last century the wealth of Ireland was estimated at two-nineteenths of that of the three countries. To-day the best authorities put it at less than one-twentieth. The population was over a third of the whole and now it is barely one-eighth. During the last fifty years, while every other country in Europe has increased, Ireland has steadily declined. The population of England has grown from fifteen to thirty millions. Ireland under the same ruler, has sunk in that time from eight and a half millions to four millions six hundred thousand. The returns of five successive censuses tell the same tale of depopulation. At times it is more rapid but at no time does it cease. During

the last two years, the administration of the government of Ireland has been in the hands of an English party as favorable to its welfare as ever could be expected to hold office, yet under Mr. Morley's *régime* the population has gone on decreasing, and no sign of any genuine material prosperity has appeared. Such a result, it is plain, is beyond the power of any administration under the present system, however well disposed its administrators may be personally.

The reasons for the admitted failure of the Union system of government to make the Irish people prosper, are too many to be reached by any legislative enactments of the British Parliament. The antagonism between the owners and the cultivators of the soil is not of a socialistic character in Ireland as it is in some other countries. It comes down from centuries of war and confiscation, in which the bulk of the Celtic population was reduced to a condition of virtual slavery in its own land and which have left their spirit still at work in the social life of the Irish people. Sympathy with English Government in Ireland means hostility to the nationality of the Irish people. The administrators of the government under the present *régime* as well as the majority of the owners of the land, and even, what would be styled in France the members of "la haute finance,"—the commercial aristocracy, all share the feeling of dislike for everything distinctively Irish. Legal reforms, educational measures and commercial enterprise alike have to contend with the dead weight of this hostility on the part of the most powerful section of the community in point of wealth and social position. English law is powerless to remove this feeling unless by giving place to Irish law for Ireland and so the home rule struggle must continue as long as the present Irish people exist.

The late change in the British Ministry is then an incident in a contest which can only end with the extinction of the Irish people in Ireland or the recognition of their right to rule themselves. That the latter will be the solution there is little room to doubt. The very conditions entailed by the present Union make any migration of people of other races into Ireland impossible. Even in this age of changes of population there is no current towards the shores of unprosperous lands. Elizabeth or James I. might think seriously that they could replace the Irish Celts by English or Scotch settlers, but Lord Salisbury can harbor no such dream. If the Union makes Ireland incapable of keeping its own natives it still more surely keeps away all others from settling in their land. Foreign rule may keep Ireland wretched but it is powerless to anglicize its people. Cromwell's attempt to transplant the Irish race beyond the Shannon, left Ireland as she is to-day, and what Crom-

well could not do will not be done by the modern Tory rulers of England.

That the Irish question must continue to hamper the British Government is then certain. It is morally certain that it can be removed by the concession of self-government to Ireland. Those two facts are patent to both the friends and the foes of Irish nationality. The question naturally suggests itself, how long the advent of the Unionist ministry is likely to postpone home rule? Its answer depends on the dispositions of the English and the Irish people. The first have the power to grant it at any moment if convinced that such is their real interest. The Irish people, like any other body of men, may imperil a just cause by mistakes or lack of judgment. The political leaders of both nations are in the same category as the two peoples. The fate of the nation for the time being rests in their hands. We shall briefly review the dispositions of each as indicated by the late elections.

The change in temper of the people of Great Britain towards the national aspirations of Ireland has been remarkable during the past twenty years. When Mr. Butt first brought forward Ireland's claim for home rule both English parties and all shades of English politicians united in declaring them impossible of concession. Down to 1883 no English statesman would even give them serious attention, and Conservatives and Liberals, however hostile on other points, united in voting down every proposal for letting Ireland rule herself.

Sir William Harcourt in one session since that date voted over two hundred times adversely to Irish proposals of all kinds. Mr. Gladstone's conversion to the Irish side in 1885 came like a thunderclap on the majority of Englishmen. In spite of his wonderful popularity, he was driven from office on that question, and the powerful party which he led was divided into two factions on the Irish question. The curious spectacle of a union between the ultra-radical ex-mayor of Birmingham and the ultra-aristocratic Marquis of Salisbury was a sign of the strength of anti-Irish prejudice among the English population ten years ago. Since that time the tendency of public opinion has grown steadily for justice to Ireland.

Two years ago Mr. Gladstone was restored to power as the champion of home rule, and his bill passed successfully the House of Commons by a fair, if not very large, majority. The House of Lords for the last two years has been the only legal obstacle to the establishment of Irish home rule. During the present century the House of Lords has never ventured to array itself permanently against the popular branch of the legislature, though it might at times delay for some time popular legislation. If the

English people should continue to demand home rule for Ireland, it certainly will not be prevented by the Lords.

That a home rule bill has actually passed the House of Commons is evidence that the English people is favorably disposed towards it, though it may delay, according to its wont, in getting its will into law.

It does not appear that the late Tory triumph indicates any real revulsion of English sentiment against home rule. Lord Roseberry's government fell from other causes. In the first place, Gladstone's retirement deprived the Liberals of by far the most popular leader in the country and lessened correspondingly the prestige of the party with the English voters. Lord Roseberry, though personally popular and clever, was everywhere felt to be a very inferior successor to the veteran statesman who had passed the home rule bill through Parliament in spite of his eighty-three years. The clever young peer, whose horse had won the Derby, and who had obtained a share in the wealth of the Rothschilds by marriage, was far below the standard of Mr. Gladstone. His position as a peer was objectionable to many of the more radical Liberals, including Labouchere. They regarded it as unlikely that he would carry on with vigor the attack on the privileges of the House of Lords, which was required for the ultimate passage of the home rule bill, and which besides was their own special object. The advent of a new and comparatively inexperienced head to the government lessened considerably the bonds of party discipline, and the illness which attacked him a few months later much aggravated the evil. As a consequence the Liberals, though in power, allowed themselves to become inactive in legislation. Several political mistakes were also committed, the most damaging being the antagonizing the liquor interest, a most formidable one, be it remembered, in English politics. The great brewers are a power in England. Their sympathies are generally Conservative, and the vacillating conduct of the Liberal ministry encouraged them to put forward boldly all their influence against it at the polls. Lord Roseberry's ministry fell, not because it was friendly to home rule, but because it showed itself incapable of any energetic Parliamentary action. We have seen similar political changes in this country which cannot be referred to any definite cause but general annoyance at the conduct of the party in power. Mr. Cleveland's majority of 1884 was completely reversed in 1888, and the verdict of 1888 was still more completely upset at Mr. Cleveland's second election. English voters are as liable as Americans to change their representatives from simple desire of change, and something of the kind has lately occurred.

It is worth note that, though the present Unionist majority in

Parliament reaches a hundred and fifty, or nearly a fourth of the whole body, the majority in the voting population is only a hundred and fifty thousand, or about one in forty. At the last election Gladstone's policy had a majority of two hundred thousand in round numbers of the electorate, though his majority in Parliament only reached forty. Such anomalies are unavoidable in any system of popular government. But in this case they are important. They show there is no sweeping change in the mind of the British public towards home rule as a political issue.

In England, at present, home rule stands as a live political question. It has strong friends and bitter enemies, but the majority, or rather the floating voters, who turn the tide of elections are uncertain in their opinion about its expediency. It is in the same state as Parliamentary Reform, or the extension of the franchise before those measures became actual law. As Disraeli on another occasion adopted the liberal measure for enlarging the electoral body which his party had so long opposed, so home rule advocacy now is a tempting subject to energetic and ambitious politicians of both English parties. Mr. Gladstone adopted it on higher grounds; but there has been only one Gladstone in British politics, and to find a similar character, we must go back to the days of Edmund Burke. In the British Empire, as in America, the party and personal interests shape the policy of the great mass of political leaders, be they Tory or Liberal. The character of the men now foremost in British politics is an important factor in estimating the probabilities of home rule in the near or distant future. The now dominant Unionists have certainly declared themselves against it, but Mr. Disraeli's career is evidence that consistency is by no means a prominent characteristic of British politicians. Their present leaders, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, are both striking examples of this fact. The former, just before the late election, was an ardent advocate of bimetallism as a remedy for the depression of English agricultural interests. He was scarcely seated in the treasury as its head, when he abandoned the cause of silver with a cool indifference worthy of Earl Beaconsfield himself. Mr. Chamberlain's public career began as a reformer of the most radical type, and his political creed approached very closely to socialism. He now holds office as an upholder of the House of Lords. The Duke of Devonshire, who is now the colleague of Lord Salisbury in a Tory administration, was for years regarded as Mr. Gladstone's probable successor in the leadership of the Liberals.

Sir William Harcourt was the most violent opponent of home rule during the first ten years of its agitation. With these examples in mind, it is safe to say that consistency on the part of public men counts for little in British politics.

With the Irish national representatives it is different. For nearly twenty years the attainment of self-government for Ireland has been without change the paramount object of their parliamentary work. Captain O'Shea is the only instance of a man elected on a home rule platform who changed his party allegiance for personal grounds. There have been internal dissensions, but there have been no desertions among them. The power of a minority devoted to one object in a larger body with varied interests is much greater than its mere numbers indicate. In the field of Imperial politics there are, at times, questions which divide the most powerful faction, and these are the legitimate opportunities of the minority which seeks an honest end with singleness of purpose. It is quite within the range of probabilities that the present *régime* may find it expedient to look for Irish help long before its six years' lease of power ends. There is another contingency not much mentioned, but which is anything but improbable. The death or abdication of the sovereign would, according to usage, entail a new election, and Queen Victoria's life is now far beyond three score and ten. It is well for the Irish people to brace themselves for a six years' struggle, but it by no means follows that they will have six years to wait for a reversal of the present condition of British politics.

The most important point, after all, in counting the chances for home rule within the next few years, is the course of action of the Irish people themselves, and their representatives in Parliament. Impatience and apathy are the chief dangers to be feared. The former may relax the bonds of discipline, which are essential to success in politics as in war. The latter may allow advantages already won to slip away, or may keep competent men from the direction of the national politics. That dissensions have occurred in the national ranks during the last four years is unfortunately true. The division into Parnellites and Nationalists caused the loss of three seats, and prevented the gain of at least two more in 1893, and has kept the ranks of the home rule representatives five or six lower than they might be in the present Parliament. The divisions between the friends of Mr. Healy and those of Mr. Dillon have been also disastrous, though they are a good deal exaggerated in the American and English press. Friction between members of the same party occurs everywhere, and there has been no more in the ranks of the Irish Nationalists than in those of either English party. Still it is unfortunate that it should occur at all at such a crisis of the nation's fate. The fault does not rest wholly with either side, and the divisions cannot be removed by mutual recriminations, however strongly either side may believe its own cause right. Mutual forbearance is the only remedy, and a

vigorous struggle in Parliament is, humanly speaking, the best means to that end.

In justice to the Irish members who have at the present moment charge of their country's interests, it should be remembered that their position is a much harder one than that of either the average English "Member" or American Congressmen. The latter are expected to devote their time to legislative work in the same way as the holder of any other public office, and they are paid for that time likewise. A member of the British Parliament attends it practically at his own discretion, and receives no compensation directly for whatever attendance he gives. The prizes to be won by party service in Parliament are, indeed, both numerous and valuable, but they depend on the ministry, not the public. The Colonial Governorships and Secretaryships, with salaries for some of them exceeding that which the United States pays to its President, the diplomatic service and a host of commissionerships of every kind are at the disposal of the Minister as rewards for Parliamentary service, and they amply compensate for any sacrifices of time in the House when they are obtained. The larger part of the members are men of wealth, who find compensation for their work in the help they are able to lend to their private interests, either commercial or proprietary, or else in the social status attached to the position. The Irish members are excluded by their position from nearly all these compensations.

It is a fixed rule of the home rule party that none of its members shall accept office, even from a home rule ministry, until Ireland obtains its own government. This rule has been faithfully maintained during the last fifteen years. Mr. Gladstone was ready to bestow the well-paid offices of the Irish Government on members of the Nationalist party, but their own rule forbade them accepting such. The landlord class, which furnishes so large a contingent of men of leisure for parliamentary service in England and Scotland, is generally hostile directly to Irish nationality. There are not more than three or four landlords, including Col. Nolan and Sir Thomas Esmonde, in the home rule ranks. The cost of attendance in Parliament, then, is a serious one for the Irish representatives. They are nearly all dependent on their personal work for a livelihood, and it is not a small sacrifice for a journalist, a physician, or a business man in Ireland to spend six months of his time in London, year after year, at constant and unrequited work. If we consider how large a part of political work in America is done for the sake of the offices, we shall wonder that the Irish Nationalist party has held together so well, not that there are some dissensions found among them.

The condition of affairs since the passage of the Home Rule  
VOL. XX.—55



Bill through the Commons, has made the position of the Nationalists a most trying one. Gladstone's efforts had, after a struggle of seven years, been rewarded by a remarkable victory, but still an incomplete one. The British friends of home rule had won control of the administration and the Commons, the two most important parts of the Imperial Government, but they were blocked in further progress by the opposition of the Lords.

The history of England shows that, in every case of serious conflict the Lords have surely to give way to the elected representatives of the people; but, it requires a certain amount of time to accomplish that result. A ministry, supported by the Commons and public opinion, could at any time swamp the House of Lords by the creation of an overwhelming number of peers, but to take such a step, the ministry must be sure of the popular support, as a new election would be unavoidable. Mr. Gladstone did not feel that he could rely on such a support in the present temper of the English voters, and hence it was necessary for his party to wait a favorable occasion for taking the final step to making home rule a reality. The fact was, in itself, a confession of present weakness, and it naturally caused a feeling of discouragement among the Irish people, and gave room for much adverse criticism among the half-hearted home rulers, and those who entertained partisan or personal dislikes to individual members. The expediency of the Nationalist members taking a more active parliamentary policy to emphasize the disposition of the Irish people on the question, was urged by some members of the party and denied by others. The risk of increasing the difficulties of a friendly though weak administration, had to be balanced against the risk of allowing the people to grow apathetic for want of political action. The decision was a most difficult one. On the one hand, Ireland continued to suffer nearly all the evils of the Union system; on the other, that system was being administered by the very men who were anxious to see it ended on the ground of its radical defects. It is human nature the world over, that such a state of things should provoke impatience and outbursts of temper among some members of a body of seventy-three individuals, and still more among a population of some millions.

Such has been the case in Ireland, but by no means to any very remarkable extent. Among the Parliamentary representatives the chief differences have arisen over the management of the *Freeman's Journal*, which is the official organ of the party. The management of a great newspaper, both in a literary and a business sense is a difficult task enough and it is small wonder that strong differences of opinion should occur regarding it in a body of seventy men or more. That faults have been committed on both

sides it is only human nature to believe, but that they have been such as to threaten disruption of the party there is no evidence whatever. It would probably be for the best interests of the country that the direct connection of the party with the *Freeman's Journal* should cease but the details of such a course must be judged by those immediately connected with it. The action of Mr. Chance in forcing William O'Brien into bankruptcy for a lawyer's bill or rather the balance of such a bill amounting to a couple of thousand dollars and for which Mr. O'Brien was only legally responsible, was the most discreditable occurrence of the last two years in the Irish party. The responsibility of it must rest with Mr. Chance, and it must be admitted that there are few political parties in any country that have not from time to time to reckon with personal scandals among some of their members. Mr. Healy's attack on the committee of the party at Omagh on the comparatively unimportant point of allowing certain doubtful constituencies in Ulster to be contested for by Liberal home rulers who were not actual members of the Nationalist party was also a most regrettable occurrence. For faults of temper, however, in a political party the only safe remedy is mutual forbearance and as far as possible, oblivion. Irish self-government may be won even though Mr. Healy entertains no love for Mr. Blake or Mr. Dillon or though Mr. Dillon's friends regard Mr. Healy as rash, and overbearing in his personal conduct. The history of our own Revolutionary War affords ample evidence of far more bitter rivalries among the founders of our Constitution than those which have occurred in the ranks of Irish Nationalists, yet these rivalries did not prevent the ultimate triumph of the American cause.

We are by no means disposed to undervalue the importance of complete harmony in the Irish Party. We are convinced that the dissensions caused by Mr. Parnell's action have been highly injurious to the cause of home rule in the minds of the English people and that their effacement would be the most effective measure that could now be taken for making it successful. But we do not believe that they have been of a nature to make us lose faith in the ultimate success of home rule. It may be that the accession of a hostile party to power will prove the harbinger of union to the Irish Nationalists of all shades of opinion. To attain that end requires above all mutual forbearance and resolute abstention from bitterness of language towards one another. To a united Irish party, Parliament, even with a hostile majority, offers a field of combat in which the national enthusiasm may be developed to a higher point than ever. In it the lines of faction should and must be effaced and we have every hope that the present leaders of the Irish people will attain that much desired end ere long.

## Scientific Chronicle.

### PRECIOUS STONES—GEMS—JEWELS. II.

IN the July number of this REVIEW we spoke of "Precious Stones, Gems and Jewels" in general. We there adopted a classification which then seemed, and still seems to us, the most satisfactory for the end in view. In this system of classification, Precious Stones, etc., are arranged in fourteen groups, beginning with Diamond, the hardest, and ending with Pearl, the softest. We then gave some details about the first group, the Diamond, and it now only remains for us to describe briefly the members of the other thirteen groups.

Dealing with the Diamond was comparatively plain sailing, but to manage the other groups is a very different matter. The prime cause of the difficulties encountered here, is that neither Chaldeans, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Greeks nor Romans had any sufficient knowledge of chemistry. Theophrastus, the father of mineralogy, was a gentleman and a scholar, Pliny was a scholar and a hustler, and they both did the best they knew how, for which we tender them our thanks. In describing Precious Stones however, they had to rely solely on the more apparent physical properties, among which color held the first place. As a consequence, stones that were almost identical were kept far apart, and stones that differed very much in substance, were classed together. Hence several words were often used to designate the same stone, and several different stones were just as often designated by the same word. Their successors for twenty centuries were in the same predicament, and the result was, uncertainty, babel, chaos, and confusion.

Armed with the deepest knowledge, and the best appliances of analytical chemistry, the moderns have worked with indefatigable patience to unravel the tangled yarn, and have succeeded in doing so in a large measure, but many points still remain undecided and are likely to remain so. Without pretending to mount into the clear atmosphere of the Higher Criticism (our balloon being out of repair) we have endeavored, with the help of such approved authors as King, Feuchtwanger, Emanuel and Dana, to tell as much truth as in us lies. With this we start in on our groups.

#### CORUNDUM GROUP.

The principal members of this group are the *Sapphire*, the *Ruby*, the *Topaz* (oriental), the *Amethyst* (oriental), and the *Emerald* (oriental). They are all properly corundums, their chemical composition being practically identical, consisting as they do of about 98 per cent. of alumina, with about 1 per cent. of iron oxide, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of one per cent. of lime. The alumina ( $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ ) is the essential, the iron and lime being considered as accidental impurities.

CORUNDUM occurs in the form of hexagonal crystals, sometimes flat at the ends, sometimes tapering; also in the massive state, and again in the form of grains, in neither of which two cases can the crystalline form be clearly made out. The Sanskrit word is *Korund*, the Hindoo, *Kurand*, but in the older English works it was usually called *Adamantine Spar*, or *Diamond Spar*.

EMERY is a granular corundum containing a considerable quantity of magnetic oxide of iron. Common corundum is found plentifully in China, the Ural mountains, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and South Carolina; emery in Asia Minor and at Chester, Mass.

On account of their hardness, in which they yield only to the diamond, both emery and corundum are used for grinding, cutting and polishing. Within the last few years a large industry has sprung up in the United States, in the manufacture of wheels for grinding and cutting, the basis of which is corundum, more or less finely powdered, and held together by some suitable cement. The texture of these wheels is regulated according to the kind of work they are intended to perform, and when properly cared for they will outgrind any grindstone, outfile any file, and out-saw any saw that was ever made for use on brass, iron, steel, or indeed any metal whatever. But let us return to our gems, the ones we are engaged with just here being the transparent crystals of corundum, which we take up in the order given above.

I. SAPPHIRE.—The stone frequently mentioned in the Bible under the Hebrew name *Sappir* is probably identical with our Sapphire. The Greeks had the word *Sappheiros* and the Romans *Sapphirus*, which they applied to almost any stone of a blue color, and sometimes to stones that were not blue, so that it is almost impossible at times to know what they were talking about. For example, our ancient friend, Theophrastus (died B.C. 287), the beloved disciple and successor of Aristotle, has left us among other valued works, a book "On Stones," but his description of *Sappheiros* therein contained, would lead us to believe that he had in view the *lapis-lazuli*, a very pretty stone indeed, but one which in modern times has been used principally in the manufacture of a beautiful blue pigment, called *ultramarine*. In like manner Pliny (died A.D. 79) gives us a description of the *Sapphirus*, from which it is even more probable that the *lapis-lazuli* is the stone meant. When however commerce with the far East became more general, the true sapphire became better known, and the inferior lapis-lazuli stepped down to its proper level without a murmur, and has remained there quietly ever since.

Sapphires have been found in many parts of the world. Large masses of the stone, but too opaque to be used as gems, have been brought to light in North Carolina, and many specimens have been found elsewhere in the United States, as New Jersey, New York, Connecticut and Montana. Transparent varieties come from China, also from Ava, a ruined city of Burmah, India. The principal mines however of this latter region are at Mogaot and Kyat-Pyan, five days' journey from Ava. The emperor generously reserves all the larger specimens for himself.

The island of Ceylon, in the Indian Ocean, is however the true rest-

ing place of the sapphire, and it is here that from time immemorial the choicest stones of this species have been mined.

In color the sapphire is sometimes white (colorless), and then it is perfectly identical with the white Topaz, and so closely resembles the diamond that a mere ocular examination, even by an expert, would fail to detect a difference. It can however be readily distinguished by the fact that its hardness is 9, while that of the diamond is 10, and that its specific gravity is 3.9 to 4.2, while that of the diamond is only 3.4 to 3.6.

Colored sapphires are of all shades and tints of blue, sometimes verging to purple. The color most esteemed is that which approximates to blue velvet of the shade formerly called "*bleu du roi*," "the king's blue," which our lady readers will of course immediately recognize. To be considered perfect in color the sapphire should be *pure*, that is, colored evenly, and should appear of the same hue by candle-light as by daylight, but many otherwise perfect gems fail in this particular. The ancients called sapphires *male* and *female* according to their tint, the deep colored, or indigo, being denominated male, the pale-blue, female.

Some translucent sapphires, when exposed to the sun or to the light of a candle, display white lines running in six directions from some one point. This phenomenon is best seen when the gem has been cut *en cabochon* (strongly convex), and when the principal axis of the crystal is perpendicular to the base of the cut stone. On account of this star-effect such a stone is called an *asteria*. Asterism occurs also in the ruby and some other stones.

The "cut" that will best bring out the good points of a given sapphire depends on the greater or less intensity of its color, and its degree of transparency. If the color is full and rich, the best form is the "brilliant," if paler, the top should be cut as a brilliant and the bottom in "steps." In setting, the sapphire is often backed up with silver, or blue-colored foil, or even with blue feathers from the head of a duck or pigeon, but a perfectly pure stone should be set "free," that is without any backing whatever.

Cameos and intaglios of sapphire are known to have been executed, but the number is quite small, doubtless on account of the great difficulty of engraving on so hard a stone, for which purpose only instruments of diamond will suffice. King testifies to having seen a beautiful head of Jupiter, one of the finest productions of the Greek school. Also a head of Julius Cæsar, the stone of an octagonal shape, and of the finest color, pure and deep. Also a head of Alexander the Great, as it appears on his coins; and of later date a portrait of Pope Paul III. by the celebrated Alessandro Cesati, "a truly inestimable gem both for the fineness of the stone itself, and for the spirit and life of the engraving."

#### SOME LARGE SAPPHIRES.

The largest pure sapphire known was once in the possession of the King of Ava. It weighed 951 carats. Its value has not been stated, but it must have been something enormous.

A beautiful sapphire, formerly in the Imperial Museum of France, weighed  $132\frac{1}{8}$  carats. It was without flaw or fault, and was valued at \$20,000. It was found in Bengal, by a poor man who dealt in wooden spoons. Later it was found in the hands of a Roman merchant, named Rospoli, who passed it on to a German prince. The latter in turn sold it to the jeweler Perret, of Paris, for \$35,000, but the finder never got beyond his wooden spoons.

Among the Crown Jewels of France were 150 sapphires of the aggregate weight of 350 carats, the whole estimated at \$120,000.

Miss Burdett Coutts, in the days of her maidenhood, was the owner of two splendid sapphires, worth together, in the estimation of experts, at least \$125,000.

The King of Aracan, India, owned one, fully an inch in diameter, and Sir Abram Hume a still larger one three inches in length.

Two sapphires, remarkable for size, were found by Charles W. Jenks in his mine at Franklin, N. C. Unhappily they are not transparent enough for gems. The first is the monster sapphire of the world, but it is off color, and opaque. It weighs 312 pounds! The other is of a better color, but far from pure. Its greatest breadth is six inches, and length five. It weighs  $11\frac{3}{4}$  pounds. Both are in the Shepard collection of Amherst College.

2. **RUBY (oriental).**—As has been already noted the ruby differs from the sapphire only in color. This varies from the palest rose tint to the deepest carmine-red. It is neither the very pale nor yet the darkest that is most esteemed, but a full, rich, blood-red. The lustre is vitreous and very lively. Occasionally specimens are found *asteriated*, and these are very highly prized.

Rubies are perhaps rather more widely disseminated than sapphires. They have been found in various localities in the United States, as Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Colorado and Montana, but these are usually too opaque to serve as gems; and the same is to be said of those that come from Australia. Brazil has furnished a few, also France and Germany. Ceylon, Sumatra and Borneo have furnished many excellent stones, but the finest are from Pegu, a province of Burmah. The traditions of the Brahmins tell of the abode of the gods, lighted up by enormous rubies and emeralds. Of course in the olden times the mines were a strict government monopoly, so much so that one of the titles of the King of Pegu was, "Lord of the Rubies." The mines are now worked by a London syndicate.

A few ancient cameos and intaglios cut in this material, some of them dating back to B.C. 500, are still in existence. Among these is a head of Hercules magnificently engraved on a rather poor stone; a splendid head of Thetis, wearing a helmet the shape of a crab's shell, the stone being somewhat irregular in shape, but of a beautiful rose color; a pale ruby on which is engraved a full face of a Bacchante crowned with ivy, the expression of the face full of wild inspiration, and the exquisite treatment of the hair and flesh beyond all praise, a true masterpiece of the best days of the Greek glyptic school.

## SOME LARGE RUBIES.

The King of Viaspur had two rubies, one of which weighed  $50\frac{3}{4}$  carats, and which was valued at \$12,000, the other  $17\frac{1}{2}$  carats, and valued at \$15,000, the latter, though the smaller, being by far the more perfect gem.

The King of Burmah, according to Emanuel "is said to possess a ruby as large as a pigeon's egg, and of extraordinary quality; but no European having seen it, its existence may or may not be a fact." The insinuation that only a European can be depended on to tell the truth, is amusing. The Empress Catharine of Russia, however did certainly possess just such a gem, which was presented to her in 1777 by Gustave III. King of Sweden.

Wahls testifies to having seen a ruby of 436 carats, and Furtière one of 240 carats, but they were Europeans, you know.

A native governor of Deccan, Hindustan, owned an excessively fine one, fully an inch in diameter; but what is believed to be the finest ruby in the world was the property of the King of Pegu. Its purity has passed into a proverb, "As pure as the Ruby of Pegu," and its value is beyond all estimation.

There are of course some fine rubies among the Crown Jewels of various nations, and in private collections, but the number of these gems, really perfect in every respect is very small.

A one-carat ruby is usually of about equal value with a one-carat diamond, while a perfect two-carat, or three-carat, ruby may considerably surpass the corresponding diamond. Still the value of the ruby is liable to fluctuate a good deal, and hence, taking it all in all, the diamond stills hold the first rank.

3. TOPAZ (oriental).—The *Topazion* of the Greeks, and *Topazius* of the Romans was what we now called *chrysolite*, or *Peridot*, of which more anon; but the transparent corundum now called oriental Topaz was by them called *chrusolithos* and *chrysolithus* respectively.

The name Topaz has reference to the place where the stone was procured, Topazos, an island in the Red Sea; the other word is derived from *chrusos* (gold) and *lithos* (a stone), and well expresses its beautiful golden color. It is the yellow *Jacut* of the Persians who describe it as being "transparent with golden lustre." The ancients obtained it from India, but very few, if any, specimens of undoubted genuineness are known to exist at the present time.

4. AMETHYST (oriental).—This gem is a corundrum whose color varies from purple to almost pure blue, and the dividing line between the very bluest amethyst and the sapphire is made out with difficulty. True oriental amethysts are so scarce, that they can hardly be called an article of commerce. A few fine specimens are preserved in the "Green Vaults" of Dresden: and in the Vatican Museum may be seen a couple of intaglios, in this stone, of very early date.

There is some uncertainty about the origin of the name. Some think it may be from the Persian, *shemest*; others that it is from some Indian word which has left traces of itself in the Hebrew, *achlamath*, the tail

end of which—*amath*—begins to spell pretty well either the Greek (*amethystos*), the Latin (*amethystus*), or the English (*amethyst*). The Greeks claimed the name as their own, and derived it from *a* (privative) and *methuo*, *to intoxicate*, because they believed that wine drunk from a cup of that material would not intoxicate, and that even the wearing of the gem would preserve the wearer from the effects of even the strongest wines. They even wrote verses on this subject, one strain of which refers to Cleopatra's signet ring, an amethyst engraved with the figure of Methe, the female genius of intoxication :

“A Maenad wild, on Amethyst I stand,  
The engraving truly of a skillful hand ;  
A subject foreign to the sober stone,  
But Cleopatra claims it for her own ;  
And hallowed by her touch, the nymph so free  
Must quit her drunken mood and sober be.”

Pliny says the reason for the name is “because these gems never come up to the true color of good wine.” Among these derivations everybody is free to choose the one which suits his taste, or else to invent a better one.

5. EMERALD (oriental). This gem differs from the true emerald, to be described later, not only in composition, but because it is of a paler tint, though possessing a superior lustre. Very little seems to be known about it, and Emanuel dismisses the subject in three lines, thus: “This, the green variety (of corundum), is the rarest of all gems, and is scarcely ever seen. In the whole course of my experience, I have only met with one specimen.”

Yet, the Iron Crown of Lombardy, which existed at least as early as the sixth century, as well as the Cross of King Lothaire, of the ninth century, and the Crown of Hungary of the tenth century, are all said to have been adorned with emeralds, some in the rough, some cut, and some even engraved. Doubts, however, remain in the minds of jewelers, as to whether they were real corundums or not.

Be that as it may, since Emanuel wrote it is certain that emeralds (corundum) have been discovered in the United States. Kuntz describes one from the Culsagee mine in North Carolina. He says that among the minerals found there “is probably the finest known specimen of emerald-green sapphire (oriental emerald). It is the transparent part of a crystal of corundum,  $4 \times 2 \times 1\frac{1}{4}$  inches, from which could be cut several pieces that would together furnish from 80 to 100 carats of very fine, almost emerald-green gems (not too dark, as is the Siamese), the largest possibly 20 carats or more in weight. As its color is one of the rarest known, it makes this specimen a very valuable one.” It is in the collection of Clarence S. Bement of Philadelphia.

#### CHRYSOBERYL GROUP.

This group comprises *Chrysoberyl*, *Alexandrite* and *Cymophane*. Their composition is, alumina 80.2 and glucina 19.8 per cent., with traces of coloring matters. In the scale of hardness they stand at 8.5.



1. The CHRYSOBERYL of the mineralogist is called *Indian Chrysolite* by the jeweler. It is a very brilliant gem, the color being "green tinged with a golden lustre," with variations towards red.

2. ALEXANDRITE appears by reflected light of an olive-green color, but by transmitted light is columbine red. It was named in honor of Alexander I. of Russia, on whose birth-day it was discovered.

3. CYMOPHANE is a semi-transparent variety of chrysoberyl. It is opalescent, and when cut *en cabochon* frequently exhibits a distinct ray running across the stone, whence its common name, *Cat's Eye*.

In the time of Louis XIV. chrysoberyls were much in vogue, and nearly equalled the diamond in price, but the fashion has long since died out, and at present they are considered of no account. The Cat's Eye alone has held its own, fine specimens of which are still worth from \$500 to \$1500 apiece.

#### SPINEL (OR SPINELLE) GROUP.

The composition of a perfectly colorless type-specimen of *Spinel* should be, one molecule of alumina with one of magnesia, corresponding very nearly to 72 per cent. of the former and 28 per cent. of the latter. This would be the mineralogist's ideal, but it is very seldom realized. We shall mention in a moment some of the divergencies from the ideal composition. The jeweler, as such, cares little about molecules and theories, but wants such forms and characteristics in his gems as will render them things of beauty; and these he finds in abundance in the spinel group.

Spinel is found in all shades and tints of red, orange, green, blue, indigo and violet, thus giving us every color of the spectrum except yellow, to atone for which omission black and white are thrown in. In the scale of hardness, spinel reaches 8. The following are the most important members of this group:

1. The RUBY SPINEL (or *Spinel Ruby*) from Ceylon is of a fine lively red color, but has a cinnamon tint mixed with it, which renders it far less brilliant than the true ruby. In this gem there is about 2 per cent. less of both alumina and magnesia than in the ideal named above, but the deficit is made up by the presence of silica and the oxides of iron and chromium. This spinel possesses the curious property that when heated it becomes brown, but during the subsequent cooling it changes to green, then becomes almost colorless, and finally resumes its original color and tint.

2. BALAS RUBY. This spinel is said to have derived its name from the ancient name of Beloochistan, which was called Balaschan, and whence the gem was obtained. It was at first thought to be a true ruby, but its inferior hardness (8), and its lower specific gravity (3.8), betrayed it. It is of a rose-pink color, very beautiful, and often occurs in quite large crystals. The King of Oude had one as large as a pigeon's egg, and of great lustre, but we are getting tired of pigeons' eggs.

The value of the Balas has always been very uncertain and variable. A 40-carat stone which in 1856 cost \$2000, was sold six years later for \$400, and three years after that it brought \$1200.

3. RUBICELLE is a spinel of an orange color. It is extremely rare, and very little seems to be known about it.

4. GAHNITE is a green spinel. It differs from all the others in containing a large proportion of zinc oxide, sometimes as high as 45 per cent., while the magnesia dwindles down to 5 or 6 per cent. The color varies from mere greenish through deep green to almost black.

5. SAPPHIRINE, as the name indicates, is of a pale-blue color. It is found in Sweden, Finland, Moravia, Italy and Ceylon.

6. ALMANDINE RUBY is a spinel whose color is a cross between violet, blue, red, and brown, the violet predominating. It somewhat resembles garnet, but is lighter in color, of a stronger lustre, and is very much harder.

7. PLEONAST and HERCYNITE are black spinels. They are found plentifully in Ceylon, Bohemia, Tyrol, and in many places in the United States. A specimen of Pleonast from Orange Co., N. Y., was 12 inches in diameter. In these varieties iron oxide almost entirely replaces the magnesia of the red varieties.

8. The white spinel occurs at La Riccia, near Rome, Italy.

#### TOPAZ GROUP.

*Common Topaz* is composed of alumina, silica, and fluorine, in slightly varying proportions. Its hardness is 8. It is found in almost every part of the world. The following varieties are known in commerce :

1. Water Drops, *i.e.*, pebbles—clear, limpid.
2. Siberian Topaz—white, sometimes with bluish tinge.
3. Brazilian Topaz—gold-yellow, with a touch of red.
4. Saxon Topaz—pale wine-yellow.
5. Indian Topaz—saffron-yellow.
6. Brazilian Ruby—light rose-red.
7. Brazilian Sapphire—light-blue.

8. Aquamarine Topaz—sea-green to mountain-green. This aquamarine must not be confounded with the aquamarine of the next group, nor yet with an aquamarine of the ancients, which belongs to the corundum group.

Formerly, the Topaz in all its different varieties was much admired, the *Water Drops*, the *Brazilian Topaz* and the *Brazilian Ruby* standing at the top of the list.

Sometimes, crystals attain large dimensions. One from Colorado weighs 18½ pounds; one in the Imperial Museum of St. Petersburg measures 6½ by 11¾ inches, and weighs 22½ pounds; one from Broddbo, Sweden, 80 pounds.

Specimens measuring ¾ inch in length, and ½ inch in diameter, have been sold for \$100. The Grand Mogul sold one of 157¾ carats for \$60,000; but nowadays they are not in demand, and good, small gems may be had from 50 cents and upwards.

#### BERYL GROUP.

*Beryl* is a generic term for several minerals which are composed, in part, of oxide of glucinum (=glucina), otherwise called *beryllium*.

The best known and most important members of this group are *Aquamarine* and *Emerald*. We have met both these names before, but the gems to which they properly belong are of this group.

1. *Aquamarine* was well known to the ancients; and Pliny speaks of the finest beryls as those "qui viriditatem puri maris imitantur," literally, "which rival the greenness of the clear sea"; hence the name, *aquamarine*, which means *sea-water*. The color, however, varies in different specimens from pure green to bluish-green, yellowish-green, and greenish-white; but, in all cases, it is pale rather than deep. Its hardness ranges from 7.5 to 8, or slightly over.

An aquamarine of 171 carats, from Siberia, was valued at \$120,000. The tiara of Pope Julius III. was ornamented with one of extraordinary size and beauty. One in London weighed 540 carats; one in Paris, 133 carats, and in the same city, an exquisite gem of 20 carats was sold for \$3000. Baron Struve owned one that was 15 inches long and 2 inches in diameter; and Don Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, had in his possession a splendid crystal weighing 18½ pounds, resembling in size and form the head of a calf; one side of it was perfectly transparent, of a fine bottle-green color and without a flaw.

The largest ones yet discovered have come from Grafton and Acworth, New Hampshire, whence we have one 3½ feet long and 3 feet thick; another, 4 by 2½ feet, and another, 6¼ feet long; and still another, weighing 2½ tons. Very large crystals are never perfect throughout, but they may sometimes be cut so as to yield a number of very good small gems.

As far as beauty is concerned, the finest specimen found in North America was from Stoneham, Me.; it was originally 5 inches long and 3 inches broad. When viewed in the direction of the longer axis, the color was a rich sea-green, but a deep sea-blue when viewed crosswise. It was cut by Kuntz, as a brilliant, yielding a splendid gem of 133¼ carats, which is now in the Dexter collection. The remnants of this stone gave, besides, over 300 carats of small but fine gems.

2. *EMERALD*.—The Emerald of the Beryl Group, as well as that of the Corundum Group, appears to have been known from the most remote times, but in ancient writings it is often very difficult to determine which of the two is meant. It is certain that no mines of this gem are known in India, and hence some have gone so far as to assert that this, the true, emerald was unknown in Europe until after the discovery of Peru by the Spaniards, in 1526. They say that the emeralds described previously to that date, in European collections, were either oriental emeralds, or else that, if really belonging to the Beryl Group, they came to Europe by way of the Philippine Islands and India. King denies this, and maintains that even long before the discovery by Columbus the true emerald was well known in Europe "from whatever region it might have been procured." When all available evidence has been sifted, the balance seems to be entirely on the side of King, and it is strengthened by the fact that the emerald is now found in Siberia, in Tyrol, at Zabara near the Red Sea, and in some other places. From Siberia it

might easily have found its way into India, and thence into Europe. Moreover, an ancient emerald mine, with large galleries bearing the marks of the mining tools, with various appliances, such as levers, cranks, etc., has been rediscovered in Egypt. From this place the Romans could have drawn their supplies, and probably did so.

However this point may be settled, it is not in the gorgeous East, but in the Western World that the Lord saw fit to deposit the great bulk of his emeralds. After the conquest of Peru, the Spaniards took possession of the hoards of emeralds which had been accumulating for centuries in the hands of the priests of the goddess Esmeralda. This beautiful lady was supposed to reside in an emerald of the size and shape of an ostrich-egg. All the other emeralds were her children, and on her festal days, immense numbers of those precious children, were offered up at her shrine. Hundreds of pounds of emeralds were appropriated by the conquerors, but many more were destroyed by an ignorant method of testing their genuineness, which method consisted in striking them with a hammer on an anvil. These statements seem to be correct, but Emanuel adds: "In spite of this, Cortez was able to present one hundredweight to the King of Spain; and on the occasion of his (Cortez's) marriage, he gave to his bride several emeralds carved into various forms, among them, an enormous stone shaped like a rose, a gift which aroused the envy of the Queen, and caused him to lose his favor at the Court." There must be some blunder here, for Pizarro, not Cortez, was the conqueror of Peru, and it was Cortez, not Pizarro, that lost his favor at the Court. We shall hardly feel at ease until the Higher Criticism has taken a good grip on this matter.

In later times the finest emeralds have come from Muso (or Muzo) in New Grenada, and the mines there were for some time extensively worked; but the government tax was so great (\$40,000 a year), that they had to be abandoned. Many fine, and some very large, specimens suitable for cabinet collections, have been found in North Carolina, Connecticut, Maine, Colorado, etc., but very few that could be cut into first class gems.

The beautiful deep-green color of the emerald, by which it is distinguished from the aquamarine, is unsurpassed by any other stone, and it has always been highly esteemed both in the rough and in the cut state, but especially has it been a favorite with the engraver.

"Neroni oculi hebetes nisi quum ad prope admota conniveret" says an ancient author. This being thrashed out literally into English is: "Nero's eyes were weak, except when he squinted at things brought near," in other words, he was very near-sighted, and hence to view the combats of the gladiators he looked through an emerald. In order to explain the effect produced in this case, it is only necessary to recall the fact that emeralds were quite frequently hollowed out at the back so as to be rendered more transparent. When this was done, the gem naturally acted as a concave lens, and so corrected short-sightedness; but the hint was not acted on for the manufacture of spectacles till more than a thousand years later.

The value of emeralds has varied a good deal both up and down, in the course of time. A very perfect one of 6 carats has been sold for \$5000. One larger than a man's head is said to have been preserved in the chapel of Our Lady of Loretto, for which an offer of over \$100,000 was refused. There was a magnificent lustrous emerald in the Crown of Charlemagne, but its value is not known. Absolutely flawless specimens are very rare, and when such are found they command fabulous prices.

In the middle ages, this stone was often used for the manufacture of cups, chalices and other vases of various forms, while the number of engravings on this gem is beyond computation. It is said that there was once a head of Christ, cut in emerald by order of the Emperor Tiberius. It was a profile, of which modern pictures pretend to be copies. In the 15th century it was taken out of the treasury vault at Constantinople, and delivered by the Emperor of the Turks to Pope Innocent VIII. as a ransom for his brother, at that time a prisoner in the hands of the christians. The whole story however is rather doubtful.

#### HYACINTH (OR JACINTH) GROUP.

1. The true HYACINTH is simply crystallized Zirconium Silicate ( $ZrSiO_4$ ), that is, a definite chemical combination of silica with the oxide of the rare metal Zirconium. The gem however usually contains a small percentage of iron oxide, which is considered as an impurity. Its hardness is 7.5. Its color is brownish-yellow, brownish-red, and orange-red.

2. JARGON (or JARGOON) differs in no respect from Hyacinth except in color, it being sometimes colorless, sometimes greenish, but generally with a smoky appearance.

In lustre and fire, these stones when first found are almost equal to the diamond, and have often been palmed off as such on the unwary, but the fraud might easily have been prevented by the test of hardness. Moreover they are very liable to fade in color and lose of their lustre, by continued exposure to the light, and however much they may have been esteemed in other days, at the present time they have no value as gems.

This stone must not be confounded with the Hyacinthus of the Romans, by which name they probably meant the oriental amethyst, or topaz.

#### GARNET GROUP.

Under the generic name *Garnet*, is comprised a long list of minerals, differing indeed considerably in composition, but agreeing in the forms of their crystals. They are found in greater or less abundance all over the world. Many of them are of interest only to the mineralogist, but some are in esteem with the jeweler. Among these latter are *Almandine*, *Cinnamon-Stone* and *Pyrope*. The composition of these three is given as follows:

<i>Almandine.</i>										Per cent.
Silica,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	36.30
Alumina,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	20.50
Iron Oxide,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	43.20

*Cinnamon-Stone.*

	Per cent.
Silica, . . . . .	40.00
Alumina, . . . . .	22.70
Lime, . . . . .	37.30

*Pyrope.*

	Per cent.
Silica, . . . . .	44.80
Alumina, . . . . .	25.40
Magnesia, . . . . .	29.80

All three usually contain also a little manganese oxide, to which in the third is added, a trace of chromium oxide. Their hardness is from 6.5 to 7.5.

1. ALMANDINE is of a fine deep-red color, inclining to violet, and in the more esteemed specimens is transparent. It was formerly much worn in jewelry, as rings, breastpins, necklaces, etc. The larger ones are generally opaque, but a remarkably fine transparent one, measuring  $\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{1}{2}$ -inch was sold for over \$700. Nowadays they are bought and sold by the pound.

2. CINNAMON-STONE (Essonite) is of a reddish-yellow or brownish-yellow color; in other respects it resembles in physical properties the Almandine.

3. PYROPE varies in color from a very deep red to almost black. In Austria and some other parts of eastern Europe it is highly prized, and necklaces of beads, the size of peas, have brought as much as \$300, but in other places the stone has little value.

## TOURMALINE GROUP.

The members of this group are of a rather complex composition but they need not detain us, as they are not the stuff of which gems are made. Tourmaline is remarkable however on account of its wonderful power of polarizing light. Two slices of transparent tourmaline may be so cut, that when placed one on the other, in a certain direction, the compound slice is transparent, but when laid together in another direction no light will pass through. This property is utilized in certain investigations in optics, but it hardly calls forth any admiration on the part of the jeweler.

## QUARTZ GROUP.

Probably more varieties and sub-varieties are comprised under the head of Quartz than under any other head in mineralogy. They are all composed of Silicon Oxide or Silica,  $\text{SiO}_2$ , either pure or mixed with a small percentage of impurities. The hardness of quartz ranges from 6 to 7.

Crystals of quartz occasionally occur of enormous size. A group of several crystals in one mass in the University of Naples weighs nearly half a ton. A single crystal preserved at Milan measures  $3\frac{1}{4}$  feet in length and  $5\frac{1}{2}$  in circumference, its weight being estimated at 870 pounds, another in Paris 3 feet in diameter weighs 800 pounds. About

a century ago a mine was opened at Zinken which afforded 50 tons of rock crystal, that brought \$300,000. Some of the single crystals weighed nearly  $\frac{1}{2}$  ton. A crystal from Waterbury, Vt., 2 feet long and 18 inches through weighs 175 pounds. Quartz is found, under some one or more of its varieties, in almost every nook and corner of the globe.

There are from 50 to 60 varieties and sub-varieties of quartz, of which about one-half exist in the form of crystals, the rest being amorphous, or at most only indistinctly crystalline. A goodly number of both kinds are used for ornamentation, but we have space to merely mention a few of the best known.

1. ROCK CRYSTAL is colorless or nearly so, and beautifully transparent. It has been used from the earliest times for seals, cups, vases and ornaments of all kinds. In modern days it has been employed for the manufacture of eye-glasses on account of its hardness, which preserves it from wear and accidental scratches, and also on account of its limpidity, in which it surpasses the best glass. If however, through ignorance or design, the crystal be not cut in the proper direction with respect to its axis, the lenses so formed are said to be injurious to the eyes. They are called in the trade "Brazilian Pebbles."

2. AMETHYST is a quartz of a more or less deep purple or violet color. According to some the coloring matter is some compound of manganese, but this we believe has not been thoroughly proved by careful analysis. Others assert that in some instances the color is destroyed by heat, and hence conclude that it is merely an organic material. However the case may be finally settled, a perfect amethyst, perfect both as to form and color, is a marvel of beauty.

3. CAIRNGORM (named after a place in Scotland) varies in color from brown to smoky yellow, much after the manner of Scotch metaphysics.

4. CAT'S EYE quartz is translucent, gray or greenish in color, and when cut *en cabochon*, displays the peculiar effect called *chatoyant*, whence it is sometimes mistaken for the Cat's Eye of the chrysoberyl group; but it may be distinguished by a comparison of its scratching powers.

5. CHALCEDONY is a variety of quartz in the amorphous, or non-crystallized state. It is at most only semi-transparent, and many kinds are quite opaque. It is divided into a score or more of sub-varieties, among which the following are the best known:

(a) *Carnelian* (*the Sard of the ancients*). The color in some specimens is clear red, pale to deep in shade; in others clear yellow. The color instead of being injured, as is the case with some other gems, by long exposure to sunlight, is often much improved thereby.

(b) *Bloodstone* or *Heliotrope* differs from carnelian in being filled with small spots of red jasper resembling drops of blood. The name Heliotrope from *helios*, the sun, and *trope*, a turning, is derived from the notion that, when immersed in water, it turned the image of the sun into blood-red.

(c) *Jasper* is of many colors, different specimens giving us, according

to some authorities, dark-green, red, brown and yellow, but in all cases with a bluish tinge, this last being its characteristic mark.

(*d*) *Agate* is a variegated chalcedony. The colors are either (*a*) banded, or (*β*) in clouds, or (*γ*) due to visible impurities.

(*a*) The bands are composed of delicate parallel lines of various shades and tints, all the way from milky-white, to inky-black. They are sometimes straight, sometimes wavy, or zigzag, sometimes concentric circular.

(*β*) In the clouded agates, the colors are of various tints, and are artistically irregular in their arrangement.

(*γ*) Colors due to visible impurities are seen in the *Moss-agate* or *Mocha-stone* which is filled with brown, moss-like forms of manganese oxide. In others the impurities take shapes somewhat resembling the branches of trees, and are hence called *dendrites*, from the Greek *dendron*, a tree, and display sometimes a beautiful forest, in miniature.

(*e*) The *Onyx* is another chalcedony, differing from the agate, in that the layers of different colors are in straight, even planes. The colors most frequently encountered are white and black, or white, brown and black, or white and red, in alternate layers, and they are perfectly well defined with abrupt transitions from one to the other.

This structure renders the onyx invaluable for cameo work, since it enables the skilful engraver to make the head, or other figure, in one color, and the background in another, thus causing the important part to appear in bolder relief, by reason of the contrast. In some rare cases even three layers have been utilized, and when the stone has been well chosen, and the engraver is worthy of his subject, the result is striking beyond description. (Mexican onyx is merely carbonate of lime, with a banded structure similar in outward appearance to the true onyx).

(*f*) *Sardonyx* is an onyx in which some of the layers consist of carnelian, or sard, and it is worked in the same way as the onyx.

(*g*) *Flint* is a compact, opaque, dull colored chalcedony. It is of course of no use as a gem, but it has been said that "Flint has shown more 'fire,' than all other stones together." This remark was perfectly intelligible to the men of '76, but it will probably be lost on most of those of the present generation.

All of these varieties of quartz, flint excepted, have been used freely in times gone by, and are still used, in the manufacture of finger rings, ear-rings, breast-pins, buttons, beads, necklaces, seals, charms, snuff-boxes, ointment-boxes, knife, dagger, and sword handles, etc.

The most celebrated engraving on agate is probably the great cameo of the Sainte Chapelle. It was brought from Constantinople to St. Louis, from whom it passed into the hands of Charles V., who placed it in the Sainte Chapelle of his palace. "It was thought at that time to represent the triumph of Joseph over Pharaoh," whatever that means. Later critics have generally agreed that it represents the accession of Tiberius to the throne, and the apotheosis of Augustus, his predecessor. The stone measures  $12\frac{3}{4}$  by  $10\frac{3}{4}$  inches. It is in three strata: the entire field is covered by the design, and contains twenty-two figures. The



execution is in every respect admirable. Many other engravings in one or other of the varieties of quartz are scattered along the path of history, some of them good, some of them bad, and "when they are good, they are very good, but when they are bad, they are horrid."

#### CHRYSLITE GROUP.

In this group we find CHRYSLITE, PERIDOT and OLIVINE, compounds of magnesia, silica, and iron oxide, with traces of nickel oxide, alumina and manganese oxide. They occur in the lava of volcanoes, and in volcanic rocks the world over. They were much esteemed by the ancients, but the fad died out ages ago, and they are seldom or never seen among the gems of the moderns.

#### TOURQUOISE GROUP.

The name means *Turkish-Stone*. It is a phosphate of alumina, combined with water, and colored by some compound of copper. Some specimens contain also a little of one or more of the following substances, iron oxide, manganese oxide, magnesia, silica. There are several varieties, the average hardness of which is 6. The colors are blue and green, from sky-blue to apple-green, but occasionally tinged with yellow. When it is in very thin sections, turquoise is translucent, otherwise it is opaque.

The Persian, or oriental, turquoise is the most esteemed, being valued four or five times higher than varieties from other parts. A good Persian turquoise, less than an inch in length and thickness, was sold in France for \$100, while a European one of the same size went begging for a buyer at \$24. Nadir Shah owned a perfect one, two inches long, which he sold to a Russian jeweler for \$3750.

#### OPAL GROUP.

From a purely chemical point of view, this group should have been left under the heading of Quartz, since it is only silica combined with from 2 to 13 per cent. of water. But our classification is in the order of hardness, and while quartz is fully up to 7, opal often gets down to 5.5 and never rises above 6.5; hence the separation. Opal is never transparent; it is usually semi-transparent, sometimes only translucent. It has a peculiar appearance which cannot be described, and which has received the name of "opalescence." From among its numerous varieties we note the following:

1. PRECIOUS, or NOBLE, OPAL exhibits, as Pliny says, "various refugent tints in succession, reflecting now one hue now another." Though called oriental, it has never been found in the East, but used to be taken there from Hungary, its native place, to be brought back with the glamour of the Indies upon it. It seldom exceeds a hazel-nut in size, but there are exceptions. The most celebrated specimen is in the Imperial Cabinet of Vienna. It is  $4\frac{3}{4}$  inches long and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches thick, and weighs 17 ounces. It is perfectly pure and displays the most magnificent hues. An offer for it of \$250,000 was refused, on account of

the uniqueness of the gem. Another one weighing about 5 ounces was valued at \$20,000.

2. FIRE OPAL was first discovered in Mexico by Baron Humboldt. It is nearly opaque, generally red with a yellowish tinge, and strong vitreous lustre, and fire-like reflections. The fire-opal is a magnificent mineral when at its best, but unfortunately it is liable to lose color and become brittle by exposure to light and changes of temperature. The largest specimen known, measuring 6 x 4 inches was presented by Humboldt to the Berlin Museum.

3. COMMON OPAL is semi-transparent with a resinous lustre. In color it is milky, or yellow, brick-red, or olive-green. Owing to its brittleness it is not in demand except for cabinets of minerals.

#### THE PEARL GROUP.

The beautiful gem called *Pearl*, is found in several kinds of oysters, clams, and mussels from the seas, lakes and rivers of Europe, Asia and America. The Pearl consists of carbonate of lime, interstratified with animal membrane. In hardness it varies from 2.5 to 3.5.

The shells of pearl-bearing mollusks are lined with a hard, lustrous, often iridescent, substance called *nacre*, but better known under the name of "*mother-of-pearl*." Pearls are concretions of this material. In form they are more or less rounded, but often present the most fantastic shapes. Some have been found that might almost be mistaken for graven images of men and beasts.

To account for their formation, several theories have been proposed. Some ascribe it to an excess of carbonate of lime dissolved in the native waters of the shell-fish. Others believe it is due to a diseased condition of the animal, which disease might be styled *pearlitis*, if that were not too barbarous. Some say it is caused by the presence of a sterile egg which the animal failed to get rid of. Others contend that it comes from the intrusion of some foreign body, as a grain of sand, from without.

A thorough examination of a sufficient number of pearls of various shapes and conditions would probably show that no single one of these causes will suffice to explain all cases, but that some of them have been predominant in some circumstances and others in others. Let us suppose then that when the mollusk is taking his breakfast, something indigestible should enter accidentally with his food. After the nourishing portion has been absorbed, that useless portion will remain. The animal will try to eject it, and perhaps may succeed in doing so, and that is the end of the episode. Sometimes however, in spite of his best efforts he may be unable to cough it out. It will then be left between the inner lining of the shell and the *mantle*. The mantle is the sack which envelops the soft body of the mollusk. This membrane is a living, sentient part of the animal, and hence the contact of a foreign body will produce in it some inflammation. Nature now steps in and bids the mantle secrete an extra quantity of nacreous matter with which to cover up and encyst the offending intruder. We know from what takes place in other cases that this extraordinary secretion is just what we ought to

expect. Thus when a grain of sand comes in contact with the ball of the eye, the irritation causes an extra secretion of *whatever the membrane at that point is capable of producing*. In the eye, this is only a watery substance that tends to wash the foreign body out again. In the mollusk the secretion is solid shell material, and this is deposited on the foreign body. When fairly covered the irritation may cease, but the stranger is still there, and as it is always in contact with the *mantle*, it gets its share of all the *nacre* secreted by the latter. Moreover, either through the efforts of the mollusk to get rid of it, or more probably on account of a natural motion of the currents of liquid circulating between the shell and the mantle, the new-born pearl is rolled backwards and forwards, or round about, and hence assumes a rounded, perhaps a perfectly spherical form. This process will be kept up till the death of the animal calls a halt. If however the intruding body should happen to become attached to a point on the shell itself, then it ought to become covered with successive layers of nacre and thus give rise to a knob or wart. Again should a boring parasite pierce the shell from the outside, the mantle would set to work to cover the opening, and build up a fortification of nacre-work against the face of the enemy; and the result would again be a wart. These warts exist frequently, and are called "blister pearls."

Let us see now how this theory squares with the facts. In dissecting pearls some have been found with a tiny nucleus of foreign matter, and this agrees perfectly with what has been said. "Blister pearls" often correspond exactly in position with holes bored into the shell from the outside.

Kuntz relates a case as follows: "The story is told of a New York lady who purchased a button-shaped pearl that had a black, diseased appearance on one side. It was so set that the imperfection was all below the mounting. When applauding at the opera one evening, the pearl was broken, and on examination it was found to consist of a very thin nacreous layer, inside of which was nothing but a hard, white, greasy clay."

In this case the mollusk must have taken in a quantity of sticky mud, and this would naturally be rolled into a ball while being covered with *nacre*.

Occasionally pearls are found hollow. In these cases the original nucleus may have been some organic matter which was, in the course of time, absorbed by the surrounding nacre, and thus a void was left at the center.

It must not be inferred from what has been said that each pearl requires a whole shell-fish for itself. If so, that would constitute a strong argument against our theory, for, in a sandy current, why should just one grain find its way into the shell? This is answered by the fact that the pearl is a social gem, and any number, from one to a hundred or more, are found in single shells. Where they are too numerous, they naturally cannot be large individually. So much for theories and their backbone of facts.

The true pearl-oyster is a native of the Indian and Pacific oceans. It is quite large, being from 6 to 8 inches in diameter, with very thick shells, greenish-black on the outside, and lined on the inside with a *nacre* of silver-white hue, reflecting various colors. This beautiful "mother of pearl," and we have seen that the pearl itself is made of exactly the same material, is extensively used in the manufacture of buttons, and handles for such small instruments as pen-knives; it is however especially well known in inlaid work for the ornamentation of both metallic and wooden surfaces.

The most noted pearl fisheries are in the East, on the coasts of Ceylon, Java, Sumatra, and at various points in the Persian Gulf. These localities have furnished immense supplies ever since the dawn of history. In the New World the early discoverers and conquerors found large quantities that had been collected during unknown ages, especially by the natives of Mexico and Peru, the northern coasts of South America and Lower California. Besides this, many of the rivers of North America abound in pearl-bearing mussels, and the Indians of former times used the pearls both as ornaments and as money.

One authority, who insists on laying down the law, says that a pearl, to be considered perfect, must possess the following qualifications:

1. It must be either round or drop-shaped, and as true as if turned in a lathe.
2. It must be of a perfectly pure white color. (This was the dictum in Europe a few years since, but the Chinese and Japanese have always preferred bright yellow, while the latest American craze has turned with wistful eyes to jet black.)
3. It must be slightly transparent.
4. It must be free from specks, spots, and blemishes.
5. It must have, in the highest degree, the peculiar lustre called "pearly."

P.S.—We might add, that it must not be stolen, much less borrowed, but received as a gift, either from a fellow biped, or from the bivalve itself, or else paid for honestly. The value of a pearl depends on its size, and on how nearly it comes up the foregoing standard.

#### FAMOUS PEARLS.

Cleopatra had two pearls which cost her over \$400,000 each. To boast that she could mix a drink more costly than any that Antony could offer, she dissolved one of the pearls in vinegar and drank it off in his presence. So goes the story. Many critics have expressed their doubts about the truth of it, but their *a priori* reasons are hardly convincing.

Some say it is *improbable*; but, unless backed up by something stronger than mere opinion, that objection is not worth the ink it took to record it.

Others say it is untrue, because it would require a stronger acid than vinegar, and a larger quantity than any one could take with impunity. This objection shows ignorance of both chemistry and medicine: First

vinegar, which is *acetic acid*, will dissolve carbonate of lime, and pearl is that with a little organic matter. Secondly, the result of that dissolving is acetate of lime, which is not poisonous even in large doses, while the organic matter that would remain undissolved is the same as we take in every time we indulge in oysters on the half-shell.

A third set say that the potion would not be very agreeable. Well, what of that? A large dose of pride and vanity would help to keep down things vastly more disagreeable, and from what we know of the lady in question, we are led to believe that she had a pretty strong stomach any how.

In the time of Elizabeth, Sir Thomas Gresham powdered a pearl, said to be worth \$75,000, and drank it in a glass of wine to the health of the Queen, in order to astonish the Spanish ambassador.

Julius Cæsar secured the second of Cleopatra's pearls, and took it to Rome, where later on, Augustus had it sawn in two and used the pieces to adorn the statue of Venus, a fitting disposal of it, considering its former history.

Cæsar had another pearl, which he came by honestly, having bought it for \$250,000. This one he presented to Servilia, the sister of Cato.

Pompey found among the treasures of the conquered Mithridates, King of Pontus, several crowns entirely crusted over with pearls, besides a portrait of the king consisting of pearls in mosaic.

The Shah of Persia has a pearl valued at \$300,000; and the Imaum of Muscat one for which he refused \$150,000; and Pope Leo. X. is said to have adorned his tiara with a pearl for which he paid \$100,000.

Philip II. of Spain had a pear-shaped pearl of the size of a pigeon's egg. It came from Panama, and is called "*La Peregrina*," "*The Wanderer*." It was valued at \$50,000. Harry Emanuel, however, gives that name to one which was bought by Philip IV., and which passed from him to the Princess Youssopoff, of Russia. It weighed 480 grains, or just an ounce troy.

An enormous pear-shaped pearl, which had been brought (stolen) from Berlin by Napoleon I., was shown at the Paris exhibition, in 1855, and a similar one is to be seen among the Royal Treasures of Portugal.

When the Directory took possession of the crown jewels of France, in 1791, they found pearls worth from \$200 to \$60,000 a piece—the aggregate value of the collection being over \$200,000.

Pearl-fishing continues to be a steady business, and the number of pearls, great and small, good and poor, that have been taken from the innocent oyster, the sedate clam, and the pensive mussel, must mount into the millions, while their value is beyond all conjecture.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

---

## Book Notices.

---

A MEMOIR OF MOTHER FRANCES RAPHAEL, O. S. D. (Augusta Theodosia Drane), sometime Prioress, Provincial of the Congregation of Dominican Sisters of St. Catherine of Sienna, Stone, with some of her Spiritual Notes and Letters. Edited by Rev. Father Bertrand Wilberforce, O. P. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1895.

The subject of this delightful book needs no introduction to American readers. Her prolific pen has made her known not only to English and American readers, but to those of Italy, France and Germany. Her literary work covers so broad a field that it reaches and interests all classes. Poetry, fiction, history, biography—all found in her a mistress whom they obeyed faithfully. Hence her works are all excellent, and some of them are unexcelled. This is certainly true of her "Christian Schools and Scholars," the "History of St. Dominic," and the "History of St. Catherine of Sienna and Her Companions." The last two have been translated and published in German, French and Italian. Beginning in 1850, a few months before she became a Catholic, with a pamphlet entitled "The Morality of Tractarianism," and ending with a paper on "The Imagination," for the Literary Department of the World's Congress Auxiliary, Chicago, 1893, her contributions to literature were continuous.

She died April 29, 1894, and her place in the literary world may remain vacant a long while. It is not the fashion now to write the lives of saints, much less to read them, and least of all to imitate them. The story of an immoral artists' model of Paris is devoured by hundreds of thousands of young women throughout the world, and many of them adorn themselves with emblems of her, while the grand life of God's great Saint Catherine of Sienna is comparatively unknown. The woman who chooses the wiser part in these latter days is worthy of honor, while she who points the way for her weak, ignorant sisters, and goes up by it before them, is worthy of imitation. Such a woman was Augusta Theodosia Drane, and the editor of this memoir places the world under a lasting debt.

The memoir partakes very much of the nature of an autobiography, because it is made up principally of sketches of her life, which the subject wrote for a friend, but which she never intended for publication. The editor has used this material in an admirable manner, allowing the subject to tell her own story as far as possible.

Augusta Theodosia Drane, afterwards called Mother Frances Raphael, was born of Protestant parents at Bromley, in the east of London, on December 28, 1823. Her father was an East India merchant, wealthy and educated. The family consisted of one son and three daughters. They lived a retired life; for Augusta says that except when they went to church or drove to town, the children never set foot outside of the garden wall. The gem of her father's house, in the opinion of his daughter, was the library—a pretty room, with books all round it. Here she early acquired that taste for reading which equipped her so well for the literary labors of after-life.

Many delightful stories are told of the child's life at Bromley, and afterwards in North Wales, where the family resided, and they all help

us to understand the woman better. On a certain occasion, when she was very young, her older sister told her that no one would ever have been saved if Christ had not died. She had never heard this before, and it surprised her very much; indeed, she was not willing to subscribe to the doctrine, and while she conceded the necessity of a Redeemer for Adam and Eve, she claimed that Abraham was able to take care of himself. "No," said her sister, "without our Lord, not even Abraham would have been saved." This was too much for Augusta, and she exclaimed, "I shall never believe that; the rest, if you like, but not Abraham!"

In 1837 the family settled in Devonshire. The Tractarian movement was then in progress, and both the vicar of the church which the family attended, George May Coleridge, and his curate were high churchmen. Miss Drane, under their direction, soon began to have a clearer comprehension of Catholic doctrine, and, to use her own words, she endeavored to work herself into Anglican orthodoxy. Her father did not approve of her High Church tendencies, and this was a source of pain to her. Before even the leaders of the Tractarian movement began to speak of confession, Miss Drane became convinced of the necessity of it, and when, in 1839, Mr. Maskell, who first agitated the question in the Church of England, heard this, he said to her, "Where you got the notion I can't think, but you were eight years in advance of your age."

It is always interesting to know the causes which bring illustrious converts into the Church. It is also very often surprising. Sometimes even converts themselves cannot give a definite answer to this interesting question. But Miss Drane is an exception. "In 1839," she says, "I had read among other things Burnet's 'History of the Reformation.' That book was the real cause of my conversion. I was too young (only sixteen), too little used to follow out my convictions to their logical issue, for the impressions received from its study to produce at the time much practical effect; but, in point of fact, not Burnet's own narrative, but the 'Original Documents' printed in his alternate volumes satisfied me, and would satisfy any one, of the fallacy of any theory which professes to regard the institution of Henry VIII., Cranmer, Edward VI. and Elizabeth as any portion of the Catholic Church. Unaware to myself, a deep sense of its unreality was imbedded in my understanding. I built on it a superficial and rather romantic structure of Anglicanism, made up of daily services and cathedral anthems, high Tory enthusiasm for Charles I. and Archbishop Laud, love of antiquities and church architecture, and intense sensibility to that picturesque view of the English parochial system, whereby souls are held captive in a false system and deprived of the sacraments of grace by the despotism exerted over their imagination by gray church towers hidden in foliage and the sound of evening chimes and the beautiful English Bible and English collects and a thousand other things which they love and worship and cling to and cannot tear from their hearts, and which yet, subjected to that terrible analysis which sooner or later they must undergo, are all but chaff on the summer threshing-floor."

One of the strongest arguments in favor of the sincerity of many distinguished converts is the painfully slow progress which they make towards the Church. This was striking in the case of Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Manning. They held on to the Anglican establishment until dragged from it by the truth, which they unconsciously resisted at every step. This was also true of Miss Drane. In 1839, the light began to dawn upon her; but not until 1850 did it fully illumine her mind. In the meantime, she was

struggling and progressing. In 1847 she became convinced that she ought to confess her sins, and to a Roman Catholic priest, because she wanted absolution, and she did not believe that any one else could give it. A friend persuaded her that she should try an Anglican clergyman first, recommending John Keble, and she gives this amusing description of her experience:

"Keble, I think, was an unsatisfactory director. He was kind, amiable, and his own humble pious character made itself felt in his letters and personal intercourse. But he never laid hands on the soul, or even attempted it, and his directions were always in the way of suggestions. The burning question of confession was at once brought forward, and Keble's direction was amusingly original, if not theological. The way he suggested of settling it was this: 'Write out your general confession and send it to me; then go to church and listen to the *general absolution* with great reverence; and that will do until you can make it in person. Meantime, keep a copy of your confession and read it over on certain more solemn day, Fridays, or even on the greater feasts!'"

The penitent tried this novel method; "but," she says, "I was too much ashamed of the absurdity ever to try it again."

In 1849, she made her confession to Dr. Pusey. "When it was over," she says, "I was as unsatisfied on the respective claims of Rome and England as before; I had as much and as little faith in the English sacraments."

About this time she first came across Rodriguez's "Christian Perfection." It was a wonderful help to her. It made her realize more fully the absence of plain teaching in the High Church party. "The uncertain voice of the trumpet blown by the authorized teachers of the Establishment, brought home to her the lack of the sure foundation of truth."

One day, when she had expressed herself strongly on this subject to Mr. Maskell, the rector of the parish, who soon after became a Catholic, he said to her: "That is strong; now just put all that down on paper--put it as strongly as you can; I will print it." The result was her first publication, a pamphlet of thirty-three pages, entitled "The Morality of Tractarianism." Newman was at that time delivering his lectures on the "Difficulties of Anglicanism," in London, and he quoted from this pamphlet.

She could not much longer resist the tide of truth. On July 1, 1850, she went to the town of Torquay, met Father Fanning, receiving the necessary instructions from him, and on the morning of the 3d, was received into the Church.

Miss Drane's progress towards a religious life kept pace with her progress towards the Catholic Church. Even before she became a Catholic, she had resolved to become a nun, and her former Anglican rector, Mr. Maskell, had recommended to her the Third Order of St. Dominic. On the day of her confirmation at Clifton, she asked the bishop to tell her something about the Third Order of St. Dominic; but he said, "You had better go over to the convent and ask them there." Her own words best tell what followed: "To the convent I went, not knowing it was Dominican. I rang, and the door was opened by a novice in spectacles. She took me into the parlor, and we began to talk. Presently, I brought out my question. 'I suppose you know that we are the Third Order of St. Dominic,' she replied. I felt overwhelmed; it was like meeting one's fate."

This novice, the first member of the Order that she met, was Sister



Mary Imelda Poole, afterwards her own Novice-Mistress ; later, Mother Provincial, and throughout her life, her dearest friend.

Miss Drane joined the community in 1852, and remained a member of it until her death, April 29, 1894. During that long period, she occupied successively every position of trust ; at the time of her death, and for years before, discharging the office of Mother Provincial.

She was an untiring worker, as her many important publications prove. She wrote very rapidly, but not carelessly, for she spent twenty-four years in preparing her work on St. Catherine of Sienna for the press. Indeed, so varied were her accomplishments and occupations, that Bishop Ullathorne described her as "one of those many-sided characters who can write a book, draw a picture, rule an Order, guide other souls, superintend a building, lay out grounds, or give wise and practical advice, with equal facility and success."

Like most truly pious persons Mother Frances Raphael had a keen sense of the humorous, which made the recreations very pleasant when she was in the house. It frequently showed itself in her letters. For instance at the close of one she writes: "Timothy (the cat) overcame himself to-day. He always goes to see the fish unpacked, and knows the fish days like an almanac. To-day he was left alone with the fish, and instead of walking off with one, he was found sitting with his back to the temptations, turning away his eyes from the iniquity. He was rewarded with a tail."

This book contains some beautiful glimpses of Cardinal Newman, and some of his charming letters, not before published. When his dear friend Father Ambrose St. John died, in answer to an expression of sympathy from Mother Frances Raphael, he wrote :

"Thank you for your letter so full of sympathy. Every one who is not cut off himself has to bear to have his friends cut off from him, for scarcely any two lives are synchronic, or end together. It has been a great shock, but, thank God, not for an instant have I been unable to recognize it as a great mercy. But I do not expect ever to recover from it ; and that I do believe to be the intention of it on the part of our loving Lord ; it is the infliction in love of a wound that will never close. You are one of those, who from the number of years you have known me, can estimate what my loss is." When Mother Provincial Imelda died, the Cardinal wrote :

"Yesterday I heard from Sister Mary Gabriel of your immense trial. But He who is immensity itself will enable you to bear it, and will turn it to good, and while your hearts are torn, you will feel (I speak from experience), that you would not have it otherwise."

Soon afterwards, he visited the convent, and asked to be taken to the choir, that he might pray by the graves of Mother Margaret and Mother Imelda. "Dr. Northcote, another sister and myself accompanied him," writes Mother Frances Raphael. "He knelt by the two graves for some time in silent prayer, and we all knelt with him. There was a most wonderful hush and silence all the time ; no sound indoors or out, but a profound stillness. It was a dull gray day, but as we still knelt there one clear bright ray of sunshine suddenly darted through the casement and fell directly on dear Mother Imelda's grave. The effect of that silence and that ray of light was something impossible to describe. The Cardinal said as he returned through the cloister: 'I would not have missed that for worlds.'"

In 1893 Mother Frances Raphael wrote that she was using Cardinal Newman's book of meditations, and found that it exactly suited her spiritual needs.

The biography proper is followed by a hundred and seventy pages of "Thoughts Suggested by Certain Scripture Texts." It is really a collection of homilies and meditations by Mother Frances Raphael on scenes in the life of Christ and on certain feasts. These are followed by a large collection of extracts from her private correspondence. Altogether, it is one of the most interesting books that has appeared in a long time. The mechanical work is in keeping with the subject-matter. The paper, the press-work, the binding—all are in the best of taste.

J. P. T.

ACADIA: MISSING LINKS OF A LOST CHAPTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Eduard Richard*, an Acadian, and Ex-Member of the House of Commons of Canada, 2 vols., 8vo., cloth and paper, pp 776. New York: Home Book Co.

Some time in the forties, Rev. H. L. Conolly gave to Hawthorne a theme for a romance, to which the novelist thus refers in his "American Note Books:—"

"H. L. C. heard from a French Canadian a story of a young couple in Acadia. On their marriage-day all the men of the Province were summoned to assemble in the church to hear a proclamation. When assembled, they were all seized and shipped off to be distributed through New England—among them the new bridegroom. His bride set off in search of him—wandered about New England all her lifetime, and at last, when she was old, she found her bridegroom on his death-bed. The shock was so great that it killed her likewise."

Hawthorne was disinclined to found a story on this incident. One day when he and Mr. Conolly were dining with Longfellow, the clergyman repeated the story, and the poet at once said to the novelist: "If you really do not want this incident for a tale, let me have it for a poem." Permission was gladly given, and soon afterwards the idyl in hexameters was begun, which finally appeared complete in October, 1847, under the name of "Evangeline."

Mr. Hawthorne said of it: "I have read it with more pleasure than it would be decorous to express." Dr. Holmes in referring to it wrote: "Of the longer poems of our chief singer, I should not hesitate to select 'Evangeline' as the masterpiece." And of the many thousands who have read the sad, sweet story during the half century since it was first penned, and who have been moved to tears by the touching recital of the brutal separation of Gabriel and Evangeline, their cruel banishment, their weary wanderings, their painful meeting, and their untimely death, not one will be found to question the verdict of Hawthorne and Holmes.

"Evangeline" gave a new impetus to the study of Acadian history. At the time of its publication the actual history of the deportation of the Acadians had scarcely been investigated. The editor of the beautiful edition of Longfellow's complete works, which Houghton, Mifflin & Co., published in fourteen volumes in 1886, writes: "It is not too much to say that this tale was itself the cause of the frequent studies since made, studies which have resulted in a revision of the accepted rendering of the facts."

The poet used the accessible authorities of the times from which to glean his history. He was altogether unbiassed, and although he did not aim at that precise accuracy which should mark the work of the true historian, he could have no reason for distorting facts; nor could he be accused of rashness who would prefer the poet's simple, true story to the so-called historian's distorted record.

The poet carries us back and away to the Acadian land, and brings

us into close contact with the Normandy peasants, so that we share their joys and sorrows. "This is the forest primeval," he says, and as he speaks we seem to hear the "murmuring pines and the hemlocks," while their forms "bearded with moss, and in garments green," rise up before us.

What a beautiful picture he presents to us of the happy village, lying in the peaceful valley, surrounded by rich meadows, with the setting sun tinting the thatch of the Norman roofed cottage, while the maids and matrons, in their snow-white caps and kirtles of scarlet, blue and green, spin the golden flax, and smile on their husbands or sweethearts as they pass with the milk-laden herds. How touching the picture he draws of the village church, where the peasants assemble to hear the word of God from their venerable curé, to assist at the great sacrifice, and to receive the sacraments. Their voices are joined in prayer and chant to sound the praises of their Father in heaven. That their worship was not a mockery we know from the sinlessness of their lives, and their patient submission to the most cruel persecutions.

The story of the marriage of Gabriel and Evangeline is the story of a people who feared and loved God. The harrowing account of the driving out of these simple God-fearing peasants from their homes, their possessions, their country, to be separated and scattered up and down the Atlantic coast, without a moment's warning, and never again to be united, is a chapter in history that any country should be ashamed to have written and read.

Mr. Longfellow hardly realized the important bearing his poem would have on the final history of the Acadians. He certainly did not intend to write history in the serious acceptation of that word, and yet his work has been the means of drawing the attention of the world to Acadia, and of inducing others to inquire into its true history. Since the poet penned his lines, Acadian history has assumed a new importance. In 1869 the government of Nova Scotia published "Selections from the Public Documents of the Province of Nova Scotia," edited by Thomas B. Akins, D.C.L., Commissioner of Public Records. In 1866 Beamish Murdock published the "History of Nova Scotia, or Acadie." In 1879 appeared "The History of Acadia, from its First Discovery to its Surrender to England by the Treaty of Paris," from the pen of James Hammay.

But the publication which attracted most attention to Acadian history, at least in this country, was Francis Parkman's work entitled "Montcalm and Wolf," which came from the press in 1885, and which devotes several chapters to the French settlers of Canada. Mr. Parkman's account of the Acadians robs Mr. Longfellow's poem of all pretensions to historical truthfulness, for he pictures them, as dirty, untidy, ignorant, for the most part idle, unskilful, rebellious against lawful authority, treacherous, and entirely under the influence of cruel, unscrupulous priests. He excuses the English government and its agents for driving them from their homes, and denies that families were torn apart, never again to be united. Now Mr. Parkman has quite a reputation for learning, and his standing as an historian is very high indeed. He certainly seemed to go about his work in the right way. He devoted his whole time to it; he visited the scenes of his histories; and he spared no pains to consult all kinds of documents bearing in any way on his subject.

While, then, lovers of Mr. Longfellow's poem were shocked when it was robbed of all its romance, no one was found bold enough even to hint, that perhaps Mr. Parkman was mistaken. No doubt many would

liked to have said it, and perhaps many thought it, but openly to contradict so great a historian as Francis Parkman, required greater courage than merely to think or to wish.

But now a wonderful thing has happened. Honorable Edward Richard, a great grandson of transported Acadians, has written a history of his people, and he has dared to contradict Parkman. Nay, more, he unqualifiedly accuses him of falsifying history. These are the very words:

"When I might have called in question the sincerity of several historians, I refrained from doing so; nay, I have sometimes been so indulgent as to suppose, against my plain convictions, honorable intentions, on the principle that it was better to sin by excess of silence and mercy rather than by too great severity. But, when brought face to face with systematic attempts, unmistakable and continually renewed, *to falsify history*, I have thought that silence became a fault, and the finger of scorn must be laid on these dishonest practices, and on those who perpetrated them with malice prepense. The exception I have just hinted at bears on the compiler of the volume of Archives of Nova Scotia and on Mr. Parkman. Regretfully do I say this, but the evidence leaves no possibility of doubt."

Again he says: "Of late years history has been enriched by an exceedingly precious collection of documents, which throw a flood of light on the very darkest part of the period. It is really unfortunate that men like Murdock and Hammay, who seem to have been sincere, had not access to this collection. As to Parkman, I have the positive proof that he knew of it, but chose to ignore it."

Of course Mr. Richard does not stop with this mere assertion. This is but introductory, and throughout his two large volumes, the author believes that he has proved his assertion. Friends of Mr. Parkman might say, that Mr. Richard took care not to make this charge while the former was living; but the latest historian of the Acadians anticipates this defence by declaring that he was engaged on his work when Mr. Parkman died, that he hoped to have finished it in time for that gentleman's perusal, and that he is most anxious that some one will take up the defence of Mr. Parkman.

It is refreshing to find that Mr. Richard's researches, backed by family traditions, have taught him that the Acadians of "Evangeline," were the Acadians of history. He pictures them as simple, honest, clean, thrifty, pious and faithful. He finds that the cause of their deportation was, "the refusal to take the oath of allegiance (to England) unless it were stipulated that they should not bear arms against the French"; and "that never, at any time, did the people dwelling in the peninsula on English territory, take up or even threaten to take up arms."

It seems strange that two historians like Mr. Parkman and Mr. Richard, who consulted the same authorities, and had access to the same documents should differ so widely in their conclusions, but Mr. Richard has offered us the explanation.

This voluminous collection is due to the Rev. Andrew Brown, Presbyterian minister, who died at Edinburgh, when he was Professor of Rhetoric in the University. While living at Halifax, from 1787 to 1795, he collected materials with the intention of writing a history of Nova Scotia. This history, incomplete and in manuscript, was found with all the original and other documents that accompanied it, in a grocer's shop, and bought November 13, 1852, by Mr. Grosart, who sold it to the British Museum in London. Some years ago it was copied in whole or in part, by the Historical Society of Halifax, in

whose archives it is now. "I am particularly indebted to this collection. . . . The importance of this MS. is obvious. An historian was needed who should be a closer contemporary of the obscure period than Haliburton. This want is now supplied, and all the more effectually because Brown's position and character would satisfy the most fastidious critic."

Mr. Brown is certainly a strong witness for the Acadians, for no one would be foolish enough to accuse a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman of favoring French Catholics against the English government.

However the fair-minded reader may decide the question, he cannot afford to ignore this last history of the Acadians. Mr. Richard is a gentleman well qualified in every way for a work of this kind. He has consulted all authorities hitherto known and quoted, and he has brought forward a new one who is certainly not the least important. He contradicts so generally accepted an author as Francis Parkman, and accuses him of twisting and suppressing facts. He brings forward such a mass of evidence to substantiate his assertions and charges, that no one, who wishes to learn the true history of the Acadians, can pass by this sadly interesting work.

J. P. T.

---

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By *Sylvester Joseph Hunter, S. J.* 12mo. Vols. I. and II., pp. 525 and 596. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The question has been frequently asked by educators, "What shall we place in the hands of advanced students to supplement the catechism?" In these days of general education, and co-education, and no-education, there is more need than ever for vigilance on the part of educators. Catholic young men and women who attend Catholic high schools and colleges, must be better equipped than ever to defend their faith and preserve it. There was a time, when a knowledge of the little paper-covered catechism was thought sufficient; but that time is past. Now, the Evil Spirit of infidelity is abroad, and his weapons are so numerous, that he who would grapple with him must be armed at all points.

The condition of things in secular institutions of learning proves most conclusively the necessity of religious instruction in a good system of education. If man is a responsible being, with a future eternal existence before him; if God exists and rewards and punishes; if He has revealed Himself to man, it is most important for man to learn these truths as early, as effectually as possible, and never to forget them. It may be possible to learn them rightly outside of school, but in practice experience shows that it is impossible. If Protestants will not recognize this plain truth, Catholics must acknowledge it.

Now we come to Father Hunter's book. Because of the absence of religious instruction in secular schools, colleges and universities, the necessity for it in Catholic institutions of learning becomes more urgent and exacting. The assertion of St. Peter, that a man should be able to give a reason for the faith that is within him, was always true, but never truer than now. If we wish to preserve our faith, we must be able to defend it; for it is attacked on all sides, and all sciences are supposed to be its enemies. Trained theologians laugh at these attacks, because they know every weapon in the enemies' armory; they know that the weapons used at the present time are the same that have been used unsuccessfully on many other occasions, and they do not fear instruments of war that have been broken and cast aside, even though some novice should have rubbed the rust off them and repointed them. The Church's

system of Dogmatic Theology is invulnerable. If we could only place this shield in the hands of our young people! This, Father Hunter has done. Heretofore, the system was so intricate, so deep, so inaccessible, that years of study were required to master it, and only professional men—generally priests—accomplished the feat. But now all that is changed. Father Hunter has translated "Catholic Dogmatic Theology" into English. He has stripped it, as far as possible, of technical terminology; he has discarded the usual dry enumeration of definitions and proofs which generally characterize such works, and substituted in its place an easy, attractive style that draws the student on, instead of repelling him, and he has accomplished all this in three handy 12mo. volumes, which are sold at a very reasonable figure.

This book should be introduced with the "Manuals of Philosophy" that have preceded it, and that prepare the way for it, into Catholic high schools and colleges for boys and girls. With the assistance of a good teacher, pupils of sixteen years of age could use it with profit. It would help very much students who are beginning the study of theology in seminaries, because it aids them to understand quickly the connection of the different parts of theology and the system as a whole. It should be in the library of every educated Catholic, because the best way to answer the many questions asked about our faith, and to refute the objections made against it, is to draw upon the authoritative teaching of the Church which is contained in her Dogmatic Theology.

ANALYSIS OF THE EUTROPIUS, a Greek Drama, presented by the Class of Ninety-six, Holy Cross College, June 20, 1895. Worcester: Harrigan & King, Printers.

In this pretty 8vo. of one hundred pages, we have a class-book that any college might well be proud of. It contains a synopsis of the Greek play produced by the class, with a metrical translation of some striking passages, and a collection of verses made by the students on various occasions. The text is adorned with pictures of the most striking scenes in the play, and the verses are accompanied with pictures of the members of the class. The whole work is in excellent taste both as to matter and manner, and while the book may be interesting only, or principally, to the students and their friends, we think it worthy of public attention.

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS. By *Joseph Gillow*. Vol. IV. Burns & Oates. Received from Benziger Bros.

The fourth volume of this valuable Dictionary contains the lives of distinguished English Catholics since the "breach with Rome," beginning with the Dominican Father Kemys, and ending with the Jesuit Father Metham. In addition to the narrative of the actions of his heroes, the learned author is careful to note their literary labors, whether printed or manuscript. The work displays vast erudition, and awakens the longing that some one should arise to perform a similar service in rescuing the names of American Catholics from oblivion. The most prominent personages treated of in the present volume are Dr. Lingard and Cardinal Manning, to whose transcendent merits in their different spheres of activity a fitting tribute is paid. We have also read with interest the information given concerning Fredrick Lucas and Thomas William Marshall.

We shall look forward with eagerness to the "fifth and concluding volume," which the publishers promise us for the early autumn of this

year, though we fail to comprehend how the names from *M* to *Z* can be compressed into a single volume, if the end of the work is to correspond to the part already perfected. It is generally unfortunate for a person who is to figure in a biographical dictionary to inherit a name beginning with a tardy initial, since authors, as a rule, grow weary after the first half of their task has been accomplished. We shall be glad if we read, when the fifth volume appears, that "the author has found it impossible to condense the matter crowding upon him within the limits of a single volume."

---

RITUALE ROMANUM. Editio Quarta post Typicam: Ratisbon and New York: Pustet. 1895.

An admirable working edition of the Ritual in small octavo, containing everything that is found in the larger edition, and thirty pages in the appendix, in English and German, concerning the celebration of the marriage rite, the reception of converts, and the mode of assisting the dying.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and other Original Sources. From the German of *Dr. Ludwig Pastor*, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited by *Frederick Ignatius Antrobus*, of the Oratory. Vols. III.-IV. London: Kegan, Paul, French, Trübner & Co. Received from Benziger Brothers.

THE JEWISH RACE IN ANCIENT AND ROMAN HISTORY. From the Eleventh Revised Edition of *A. Rendu, LL.D.* Translated by *Theresa Crook*. London: Burns & Oates. Received from Benziger Brothers. Price, \$2.25.

THE IROQUOIS AND THE JESUITS. The Story of the Labors of Catholic Missionaries Among these Indians. By *Rev. Thomas Donohoe, D.D.* Buffalo, N. Y.: Buffalo Catholic Publication Co. 1895.

DIVINE LOVE, AND THE LOVE OF GOD'S MOST BLESSED MOTHER. By *Right Rev. F. J. Wild*, Protonotary Apostolic. 12mo., boards, pp. 575. Received from Benziger Bros.: New York.

MUSTER DES PREDIGERS. Eine Auswahl rednerischer Beispiele aus dem homiletischen Schätze aller Jahrhunderte. Von *Nikolaus Schleinitzer, S.J.* Herder 1895. Price, \$2.85.

GESCHICHTE DES BRIEVIERS. Von *P. Suitbert Bäumer, O.S.B.* Herder. 1895. Price, \$2.85.











To avoid fine, this book should be returned on  
or before the date last stamped below

ZOM-8-48





DATA



